PREFACE

The following pages are meant to serve as an introduction to the study of Viśākhadatta and his Mudrā-Rākṣasa In seven chapters I have tried to deal with all the important topics concerning Viśākhadatta and his play that a student of Sanskrit literature may be expected to know Chapter I gives all the available information about Viśākhadatta and discusses the problems of his date, patronage, and scholarship The second chapter gives a detailed analysis of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa and is followed by an equally detailed critical appreciation thereof in the next chapter Characters in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa form the subject matter of the chapter that follows, which also contains a discussion regarding the hero of the play The sources are dealt with in the next chapter, while in chapter VI the play is analysed from the view-point of Viśākhadatta's workmanship; and an attempt is made to point out the various devices by means of which he has succeeded in transforming the dry bones of the tale derived from his sources into an artistic play Herein are also discussed questions like the three unities, the Mudrā-Rākṣasa and the stage, and the structure of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa according to the rules of Sanskrit dramaturgy The last chapter is devoted to the society as reflected in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa and discusses also the view, formerly held by some regarding its standard of morality on the whole

From this brief description of the contents of these pages it will be evident that I have tried to make this introduction as complete as possible even for the purposes of the University student In this work I have utilized the labours of all my predecessors in the field, and I thank them all here for all the valuable help I have derived from them Special mention may, however, be made of the editions of the play by Telang

and Prof Dhruva, and also of the 'Signet Ring' a masterly English translation of the play with a highly valuable Post-script and Introductory Note by R S Pandit

It is needless to add that I shall feel my labours well re paid if these pages are found useful by those for whom they are intended, and that any suggestions for improvement will be gratefully received

G V D

H P T College, Nasik
12th October, 1948

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE AUTHOR

It is quite a usual experience, painful though it be, of a student of Sanskrit literature to be confronted with insurmountable difficulties in his attempt to gather personal information about any particular author and fix his date even by the century The authors themselves, for reasons of their own, are more often than not very reticent about themselves , and most of them do nothing beyond giving their own name and that of their work, and sometimes the names of one or two of their ancestors A few others are found to add the name of their patron or a contemporary ruling prince who very often is found to be almost impossible to identify beyond any doubt The result of all this naturally is very tantalising to the student of Sanskrit literature, particularly when he finds names like Kālidāsa also tossed to and fro through a period of several centuries Dates in Sanskrit literature form an unending problem, indeed ! And Viśākhadatta is not an exception to the general rule

Our knowledge about the personal account of Viśākhadatta does not go much beyond what he himself has given in the prologue and the Bharatavākya of his Mudrā-rākṣasa But even there we are confronted with *variae lectionae* which go a long way to create confusion Thus the very name of the author is found spelt in two different ways as *Viśākhadatta* and *Viśākhadeva* But this need not detain us very long , for we find that the names of both the father and the grandfather of our author end in *datta*, a circumstance which helps us to conclude that his name also must have a similar ending Thus we know that the author of the Mudrā-rākṣasa is Viśākhadatta (a poet), son of Mahārāja Bhāskaradatta, and grandson of Sāmanta. Vateśvaradatta

About his caste and native place we are left completely in the dark But it may be noted that the two principal characters in the play are Brāhmana by caste Again in act VII when Cānakya is about to touch Rāksasa, the latter tells him that he is contaminated by the touch of the Cāndālas and as such should not be touched, and the former sets aside his misapprehension by declaring that those whom he took for Cāndālas were none but his own trusted spies [1] These facts together with the respect shown in the play to the Brāhmanas in the prologue,[2] and the absence of Vidūsaka[3] perhaps may be interpreted as indicating that our author, like those of the Venīsamhāra and the Uttara-Rāmacarita, had a soft corner for the Brāhmanas, and this may again be taken to suggest that Viśākhadatta himself was a Brāhmana As for the native place of our author nothing can be said very definitely, though from the geographical knowledge displayed by him one may be justified in concluding that he was a northerner Beyond that, however, we may not go for want of any sure grounds 'The assumption', says Dr De, 'that the drama is a Bengal work is purely gratuitous and conjectural [4] Nor can our author be said to hail from Kāśmīra from the way in which the Kāśmīra prince Puskarāksa is referred to in the play itself [5] We must, therefore, leave this question here only and pass on to the next, arising out of the reference in the Bharata-vākya

Unfortunately here also we are pursued by the discomfiting *variae lectionae* viz *Candraguptah, Avantivarmā, Dantivarmā,* and *Rantivarmā,* and two others which are obvious corruptions of the last one, which itself is rather suspicious Dantivarmā is said to be the reading of several southern MSS and is, on that account, accepted as the correct reading by some scholars [6] Dhundirāja, a commentator, reads Candragupta and some [7] scholars follow him in this respect Nor are champions[8] wanting for the reading Avantivarmā Whatever be the correct reading, it is to be observed that Viśākhadatta is

here referring evidently to a ruling prince of his day But it is doubtful whether the prince, thus referred to in the Bharata-vākya, is also a patron In fact there is nothing to warrant such an assumption

It is, however, obvious that fixing the reading in the Bharata-vākya and then fixing the identity of the prince referred to therein would go a long way to settle the problem of the date of our author We have already seen that there are champions for all the readings except Rantivarmā and its variants, which makes it impossible for us to fix the reading with certainty It may yet be interesting to see how attempts have been made to identify the various princes mentioned in the various readings and how our author is assigned variously to different centuries of the Christian era

Dhundirāja, the commentator referred to above, accepts the reading Candraguptah and identifies him with king Candragupta Maurya, one of the characters in the play itself This view, however, has been rejected on the ground that the stanza in which it occurs does not form an integral part of the play Such a reference may only be taken as a eulogy of some contemporary prince Some scholars,[9] therefore, suggest that the reference here is to some prince bearing the name Candragupta whom they identify as Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty This view they try to justify by arguing that the play shows Kusumpura in a flourishing condition and that Buddhism in the play appears to be still far from its decay and disappearance in India—conditions which obtained when Fa Hien was in India, but were absent when India was visited by Hiuen Tsang Jayaswal[10] lends support to this view by pointing out that our play contains a covert defence of the scandalous murder of the Śaka Satrap by Candragupta mentioned by Bāna in his Harṣacarita According to these scho-

lars then Viśākhadatta is a contemporary of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty, and must, therefore, belong to the 5th century A D

Mr Rangaswami Sarasvati[11] on the evidence of several old and reliable Malabar MSS of the Mudrā-rākṣasa accepts Dantivarmā as the correct reading and identifies Dantivarmā as the ruler of the Pallava dynasty about 720 A D This identification, however, is far from being acceptable for more reasons than one,[12] the most important of them being that this king is not known to have saved the land from the tyranny of the Mlecchas, as he is described to have done in the Bharatavākya

The reading Avantivarmā is favoured by Telang inspite of the fact that he has accepted in his text the reading Candraguptah which he has done evidently to be in conformity with the commentary of Dhundirāja which he has published According to him the Avantivarmā mentioned here is the Maukhari prince of that name, father of Grahavarman, the husband of Rājyaśrī, the sister of Śrī Harsa of Kanouj This view has been accepted by Macdonell, Rapson, and Dhruva There is, however, one more Avantivarmā known to Indologists, the one who ruled at Kāśmīra from 857 to 884 A D Jacobi[13] accepts this identification and holds that the play was actually enacted before the prime minister of the Avantivarmā on the second of December, 860 A D But in the play itself we see Viśākhadatta describing Puṣkarākṣa,[14] the prince of Kāśmīra as a mleccha (a derogatory term), which he would not have done had he really been a protégé of Avantivarmā of Kāśmīra

It would thus be seen that there are two views which appear to be equally strong (i) that Viśākhadatta flourished under Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty (375-413 A D), and (ii) that Viśākhadatta's patron was Anantivarmā Maukhari (579-600 A D) Let us now turn to other pieces of evidence

availab'e in this connection and in their light try to fix if possible the date of Viśākhadatta

In this connection three points deserve to be taken into consideration one by one First there is the idea about the moon-eclipse In the prologue the Sūtradhāra declares that he is well-versed in the Jyotih-śāstra and that, for aught he knows, though the wicked planet is about to swallow the Candra, yet he would be saved from the danger owing to his conjunction with Budha The idea of the Budha-yoga having a counteracting influence on the moon-eclipse was prevalent before the days of Varāhamihira who has merely repudiated it in his famous Brhatsamhitā [15] This shows that Viśākhadatta must be rather earlier than Varāhamihira (c 490 A D) The next point to be considered is the attitude shown by our poet towards Jainism and Buddhism In Act VII St 5 the deeds of the Buddhas are referred to with great respect[16] which shows that Buddhism was yet held in good esteem This naturally points to a date far anterior to that of its decay after the seventh century Reference to the trouble of the Mlecchas in the Bharata-vākya[17] is the last point that we may note here Wilson[18] identifies the Mlecchas with the Pathan princes and assigns the play to the 11th or the 12th century Talang,[19] on the other hand, is inclined to identify the Mlecchas as the early Muhomedan invaders of India and assigns the work to the 7th century A D Mcdonell and Rap son agree with him But it is not unlikely that by Mlecchas are to be understood the Hūnas who were a growing menace in the Gupta period It is even more probable that this plot suggested itself to our author on account of the identity of the names of the princes

The date problem has been attacked in yet another direction on the basis of resemblances of ideas and phraseology between the Mudrā-rāksasa on the one hand and some other works in Sanskrit literature on the other Thus it is found

that the second benedictory stanza of our play closely resembles the Harivijaya, II 55-56 of Ratnākara, a court-poet of Avantivarmā of Kāśmīra But this resemblance only proves our author's priority over Ratnākara, since, as we have already seen above, this Avantivarmā can't be the prince referred to by him A similar resemblance is to be noticed between Mu Rā IV 10 and the Kirātārjunīya II 47 cd of Bhāravi who belongs to the close of the 5th century A D Raghuvaṃśa VII 43 & 56 have again been adduced as parallels to Mu Rā V 23 and VII 21 respectively But the coincidences here are only too feeble to be of any use in settling the question of chronology for good The same perhaps may be said about the coincidence between Mu Rā I 14d and the Śiśupālavadha, XVI 84d, for though the change of *ca* into *api* has been declared to be introduced by Māgha merely for the sake of change, it must be admitted that this may not be accepted as a very conclusive evidence for fixing the date of Viśākhadatta [20] Resemblances between our play and the Mrcchakatika are indeed close and numerous also[21], and it would not be wrong to conclude on their strength that our author had the Mrcchakatika before him when he composed the present play But this does not help us much in fixing the date of Visākhadatta since the date of the Mrcchakatika itself is as yet an open problem There is one more case of this type Mu Rā II 17 is found to correspond to the 27th stanza of Bharatrhari's Nitiśataka From this it is argued that the Mudrārāksasa is earlier than 651 A D, the year in which Bhartrhari is said to have passed away But even here a difficulty crops up owing to the presence of varia lectio viz "°nās tvam ivodvahanti" or "°nā na parityajanti" If the former is the genuine reading we shall have to conclude that the stanza primarily belongs to the play because of the dramatic mode of expression in which it is couched Bhartrhari would in that case be the borrower and hence later than our author

But if the second reading is genuine the tables would be turned just the opposite way thus proving the priority of Bhartrhari over Viśākhadatta There is also a third probability of both the authors having borrowed from some common source The author of the Daśarūpāvaloka[22] accepts the first reading as given above and attributes the stanza to Bhartrhari This circumstance adds to our difficulty and makes the problem still more trite In general, however, it may here be observed that any attempt to fix the date of our author on the strength of verbal resemblamces between Mu Rā on the one hand and some other works in Sanskrit literature on the other is bound to be futile, though such resemblances may at the most be taken to indicate a probability in a certain direction

Let us now turn to the external evidence that is available for fixing the date of Viśākhadatta There are several commentaries[23] on the Mudrā-rāksasa But none of these is known to be earlier than about the middle of the 14th century A D The same is the cases with the other versions[24] of the story of the play, both in prose as well as in verse, the earliest of these being the prose version of Ananta Pandita (first half of the 17th century A D) Thus we find that the evidence supplied by these is not of much value for our purposes Among anthologies we find only two containing verses ascribed to Viśākhadatta or Viśākhadeva Vallabhadeva in his Subhāsitāvalī has quoted two verses[25] of Viśākhadeva whom Mr Peterson identified with the author of the Mudrā-rāksasa This identification is not generally accepted, nor are the verses in question to be found in our play Srīdharadāsa in his Saduktikarnāmrta has given two stanzas[26] as composed by Viśākhadatta Even these are not to be traced in the Mudrā-rāksasa But if the author of these stanzas is the same as our author he can be placed before 1205 A D The earliest work to quote from the Mudrā-rāksasa and refer to it by name is the Daśarūpāvaloka of Dhanika (10th century A D) It,

therefore, follows that Viśākhadatta is much earlier than the 10th century A D There is, however, one more passage[27] in the Daśarūpāvaloka which has been utilised by some scholars in this connection Thus at the end of the first chapter of the work we find the remark '*Bṛhatkathāmūlam mudrārākṣasam*' from which it would appear that the Mudrā-rākṣasa is based on the Bṛhatkathā But this passage itself has been proved to be spurious and hence quite unreliable [28]

We have thus far seen that Viśākhadatta has been variously assigned to several centuries upto the 12th Of these several theories, however, there are only two which have some probability about them The theory that Viśākhadatta was a contemporary of the great Gupta emperor Candragupta II has to face 'the difficulty of taking the term Mleccha in the sense of the Hūṇas and of explaining the word *udvejamānā* satisfactorily in terms of the known facts of Candragupta's time' The theory that Viśākhadatta flourished under Avantivarmā Maukhari, on the other hand, is vitiated by the discovery made by Hillabrandt's critical edition of the Mudrā-rākṣasa that the variant Avantivarmā is most probably a later emendation [29] The question of Viśākhadatta's date must, therefore, be regarded as unsolved, though in the light of the evidence discussed so far one may be justified in placing him among the older group of dramatists who succeeded Kālidāsa and flourished much before the 9th century A D [30]

Let us now pass on to discuss the scholarship of Viśākhadatta Here at the very outset it may be observed that a drama is not a work where an author may be expected to parade his scholarship and learning, and yet it is but natural that some glimpses of the author's knowledge of various branches of literature and arts and also his varied experiences may be found in his work There is, therefore, nothing unnatural in trying to gather all such glimpses from a work and try to form, on their basis, some idea about the scholarship of

its author If we read the Mudrārākṣasa from this point of view we shall find Viśākhadatta showing his acquaintance, (and sometimes even proficiency) not only with *belles-lettres* but also with scientific works and also with fine arts To even a causal reader is evident the mastery of Viśākhadatta over the Sanskrit language and its grammar The very fact that he has in his Mudrā-rākṣasa used no less than seventeen metres,[31] and quite successfully too, is enough to show that he has good acquaintance with Sanskrit prosody Variation of style in accordance with the subject-matter and the use of various figures of speech bear ample testimony to his knowledge of Sāhitya-śāstra That he must have studied dramaturgy and acquired proficiency in it can very well be seen from the way in which he has succeeded in shaping a highly interesting play out of the sordid and crude material that he could gather from his sources, historical as well as Pauranic But that is not all In two places at least he has referred to technicalities of dramaturgy, thus showing his deep interest and proficiency in that science Thus in the sixth act of the Mudrā-rākṣasa when Siddhārthaka tells Samiddhārthaka that Malayaketu has been captivated by Bhadrabhata and others the latter in wonder, asks how it could be , for Bhadrabhata and others were known to have resorted to Malayaketu out of disaffection for Candragupta It is here that Samiddhārthaka by way of comparison adds that the situation was just like a drama composed by an inferior playwright in which the matter in the beginning (i e mukhasandhi) differs widely from that in the end (i e nirvahanasandhi)[32] The reference here to the two sandhis and also to the rule, that the matter in both these sandhis must be the same for a drama to be successful, shows clearly that Viśākhadatta was very well acquainted with Nātyaśāstra The same again is shown by the third stanza[33] of the fourth act of the Mudrārākṣasa where Rākṣasa compares the worries of a minister like himself to those of a play-

wright, and while doing so uses certain technical terms of dramaturgy In fact this stanza has been quoted by Vāgbhata in his Kāvyānuśāsana as showing Viśākhadatta's proficiency in nātyaśāstra The use of the various Prakrits in the play can be taken to be indicative of Viśākhadatta's acquaintance with and mastery over the Prakrits Through one of his characters Visākhadatta would even seem to declare that he is also a prākrta kavi [34]

Indications are not wanting of the sound knowledge of Viśākhadatta of other branches of scientific literature The whole play is deeply saturated in a political atmosphere The plots and the counter-plots of Rāksasa and Cānakya, the bristling crowd of spies on either side, the atmosphere charged with suspicion, trials and punishments, and the highly political discussion between Cānakya and Candragupta—all these show Viśākhadatta's deep knowledge of Arthaśāstra The impression thus gathered is further confirmed by the exuberant use of the technical terms[35] of Arthaśāstra almost at every step There is also a direct reference to the arthaśāstrakārāh in general and to the Dandanīti[36] of Uśanas in particular The other science in which our author seems to be proficient is the jyotih-śāstra In the very prologue of our play we find the sūtradhāra referring to his proficiency in this science with all its sixty-four parts and declaring that there would be no moon-eclipse that day since the conjunction with Budha is sure to save the moon from the danger [37] We have already observed above that the idea about the moon-eclipse being counter-acted by the budha-yoga belongs to the Samhitā period i e prior to the date of Varāhamihira Again we are told that Jīvasiddhi the ksapanaka is only a Brāhmana named Induśarman who is proficient not only in politics but also in *catuhṣastyanga jyotihśāstra* [38] A deeper knowledge of this science is displayed by the author in Act IV where Rāksasa requests the monk to find out an auspicious day for him to start an expedition, and

the latter in very technical terms points out that the evening of that very day (it was full-moon day of Mārgaśīrṣa) was very auspicious, indeed! And when Rākṣasa raises an objection saying that the tithi was not quite auspicious, the monk points out that the influence of *naksatra* and *lagna* is four and sixty-four times respectively as much as that of the *tithi*, so that it would not be wise on the part of Rākṣasa to let such auspicious day pass off simply in view of the *tithi* He also adds further that the lagna of Budha is very auspicious and that Rākṣasa would derive great benefit if he goes by the auspicious influence of the moon [39] From all this it will be quite evident that Viśākhadatta was a deep student of the jyotiḥśāstra The other śāstra which our author seems to have thoroughly mastered is the nyāya The Mudrā-rākṣasa V 10[40] speaks of the five conditions which every *hetu* has to satisfy if it is to be valid, and also of the fallacies arising from the violation of one or more of these conditions It also contains the technical term *nigraha*, and the fact that the nyāya terminology has been utilised by our poet for a simile to illustrate the conditions which crown a king with success or land him into disaster and defeat is enough to convince the reader of Viśākhadatta's proficiency in Nyāya

Viśākhadatta has also shown his acquaintance with our mythology by referring to the tāndava dance of God Śiva in his nāndī [41] to the idea of God Viṣṇu waking up in the month of Kārtika[42] (on the ekādaśī, which on that account is called the prabodhinī ekādaśī), to the story of the śakti conferred by Indra on Karna who had preserved it really for destroying Arjuna, but had to spend it on Ghatotkaca, son of Bhīma by Hidimbā,[43] to the destruction of the Vṛṣṇis,[44] and to the famous story of king Śibi offering his own flesh just to save a pigeon from a falcon[45] (who were in fact Agni and Indra respectively so disguised) Viśākhadatta seems to be acquainted not only with the Brahmanical religion and also the pauranic

idea of feeding Brāhmanas at the time of the moon-eclipse[46] or some feastive occasions or of giving away things belonging to the deceased to Brāhmanas by way of obsequal gifts,[47] but also with the so-called heretical systems of Buddhism and Jainism[48] Of the fine arts we find the art of painting referred to in one place[49] in our play, and we may reasonably infer from that reference that Viśākhadatta had some acquaintance with that art also

We may now bring this chapter to a close by making a brief reference to the other works ascribed to our author Here it must be observed at the very outset that no other work of Viśākhadatta has come down to us in any form, though from references in other works he would possibly seem to have composed some more works beside the Mudrā-rākṣasa Thus we find Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra quoting seven times from a work named Devīcandragupta,[50] ascribing it to Viśākhadeva This work has not as yet been unearthed, but from references and citations it would appear that it is a drama in five acts, if not more, dealing in all probability with the story of Kumāra Candragupta in the guise of a woman rescuing Dhruvadevī who had been abducted by a Śaka prince This work is again referred to by Bhoja in his Śṛngāraprakāśa and also by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata, of course, without naming the author[51] Abhisārikāvañcitaka or Abhisārikābandhitaka is yet another work[52] —again a drama in all probability—which has been referred to and quoted from by both Abhinavagupta as well as Bhoja This also is ascribed to Viśākhadeva It is based on a love legend of Udayana and Padmāvatī The former left the latter under the suspicion that she had killed his son, when disguising herself as a Śabarī and playing the role of an abhisārikā, the latter won back the love of her tender-minded husband It must here be observed that both these works are said to be the work of Viśākhadeva (and not Viśākhadatta)

whose identity with the author of the Mudrā-rākṣasa is by no means very definitely established Prof Dhruva[53] has pointed out that the Sadukti-karṇāmṛta quotes two stanzas ascribing them to Viśākhadatta , and concludes that our author must have composed another drama based on the story of the Rāmāyana Besides these there are two anuṣṭubh verses[54] which in the Subhāṣitāvalī are ascribed to Viśākhadeva whom Dr Peterson is inclined to identify with the author of the Mudrā-rākṣasa, relying on the variant reading in the prologue which would give the author's name as Viśākhadeva This identification has, however, not been generally accepted Our author can, therefore, be said to have composed only one play to be sure, while the ascription of the other works or plays to him is rather doubtful depending as it does on the assumption of the identity of our Viśākhadatta with that of the Subhāṣitāvali and also with Viśākhadeva referred to by Bhoja, Abhinavagupta, and others

CHAPTER II

THE PLOT

The Prologue

After the recital of the nāndī suggestive of the arduous task and the limitations that Cāṇakya has set himself and also the crooked policies involved in the whole affair, the stage-manager appears on the stage saying that he has been asked to enact the Mudrā-rākṣasa, a fresh play from the pen of the poet Viśākhadatta, son of Mahārāja Bhāskaradatta, and grand-son of Sāmanta Vaṭeśvaradatta He is quite confident of success in his undertaking since he has been fortunate enough to have an appreciative audience So he proposes to have some music, and hence turns homeward Entering his home he finds all the inmates there very hotly busy in grand preparations His curiosity is roused and he calls his wife and asks her the occasion for all this He is told in reply that Brāhmanas have been asked to dinner, for it is reported that there was going to be a moon-eclipse that day The stage-manager assures his wife that the rumour was quite baseless, for from what he knows of astronomy—and that is not a little —he can see that the malicious planet is about to swallow the Candra, full as he is, but that its conjunction with Budha is sure to save the Candra from the danger While the stage-manager is thus assuring his wife, from behind the curtain is heard the question as to who dared to attack Candra as long as he was there? The naṭī wonders who it was that, creature of this mortal world that he is, had the ambition of saving the Candra against the attack of a planet The stage-manager, in order to make the person repeat his question, repeats what he has already said and on listening to the question recognizes

that it was Cāṇakya who has mistaken the whole context and understood candra-grahana in his speech to stand for an attack on Candragupta by the enemy At this the stage-manager leaves the stage along with his wife, and Cānakya appears on the stage repeating the same question in an angry mood

ACT I

Cāṇakya, as we have already seen, has appeared on the stage in an agry mood Then taking his seat on a chair to which his attention is drawn by his pupil, he indulges in a monologue which makes us acquainted with his various schemes and plots and also the purpose behind them all He begins by complaining against the publicity received among the citizens of Kusumpura by the fact that Rākṣasa, incensed by the destruction of the Nanda race, has formed an alliance with Malayaketu roused to anger by the assasination of his father and is preparing to launch an attack on Candragupta with a vast army Soon, however, he regains his confidence and declares that he can check all such rumours and adds that he, inspite of the fulfilment of his vow, will continue to be Candragupta's minister till Rāksasa is yoked into the service of the latter It is with this end in view alone that he has caused the last scion of the Nanda race, Sarvārthasiddhi, to be assassinated But instead of being disheartened thereby, Rākṣasa has still continued his loyalty to his former masters and made all the greater efforts to destroy Candragupta and his party by forming an alliance with Malayaketu It is on account of this very noble trait in his character that Cānakya desires so ardently to win over Rākṣasa to Candra-gupta

Various indeed are the measures taken by Cānakya to accomplish his object He has set afloat a rumour that it was Rākṣasa who has killed Parvataka, an ally of Candragupta (and consequently of Cāṇakya) through a poison-maiden To give full credence to this rumour he has scared away Malaya-

ketu, the son of Parvataka, through Bhāgurāyana by letting him know that his father was killed by Cānakya Spies under various disguises have been employed with a view to ascertain the loyalty or otherwise of the people Trustworthy persons of veritable integrity and devotion have been employed as aide-de-camp of Candragupta And last, but not the least, a dear friend versed in politics and astronomy has already been sent to form close friendship with all the ministers of the Nandas under the guise of a Ksapanaka Thus Cānakya is now quite confident that but for Candragupta's indifference towards administrative affairs nothing is amiss on their side He, at the same time, does not fail to appreciate the attitude of indifference shown by Candragupta

While Cānakya is thus indulging in his monologue *within*, one of his spies (Nipunaka) in the guise of a yāmapatika is seen *without* singing in praise of Yama, and trying to enter into the abode of Cānakya At the door, however, he is stopped by Cānakya's pupil, who takes all his talk to be only irrelevant and nonsensical Cānakya, of course, catches the inner significance of the remarks and asks him to come in At once Cānakya recognizes him to be Nipunaka and asks him to give an account of his mission

Nipunaka tells that all were deeply attached to Candragupta, except three viz (i) Jīvasiddhi, a monk, who is reported to have directed the poison-maiden sent by Rāksasa to Parvateśvara, (ii) Śakatadāsa, a dear friend of Rākṣasa, and (iii) Candanadāsa, a very rich jeweller with whom Rākṣasa has kept his wife and children before leaving the capital Cānakya knows that the first is none but his own dear friend, and that the second is only a kāyastha, to manage whom Siddhārthaka has already been directed The third, he concludes, must be Rāksasa's dearest friend, and asks how Nipunaka came to know that Rākṣasa's family was with him When Nipunaka in reply only produces Rākṣasa's signet ring, Cānakya in joy

says to himself that it is not the ring but Rākṣasa himself that has fallen into his hands

At Cāṇakya's desire Nipunaka then narrates how as he was singing his songs and displaying the yamapata at the house of Candanadāsa, a bonny child about five years old came out of an apartment and after a hue and cry was taken back per force by one woman whom he could not clearly see In that confusion, however, a ring dropped down from the hand of the woman and rolled on to him without being noticed by her Finding that it bore the name of Rākṣasa he thought it fit to hand it over to Cānakya Nipunaka is promised good reward for all this service and given leave to depart

The ring now sets Cāṇakya thinking He orders ink and paper to be brought and is thinking out the contents of his proposed letter by which Rākṣasa must be captured, when a messenger comes in with Candragupta's request to be allowed to perform the obsequies of Parvateśvara and give away the latter's ornaments to Brāhmaṇas Cāṇakya readily grants the request, only desiring Candragupta to give the ornaments to the worthy Brāhmaṇas who would be sent by him after properly putting them to test Immediately Cāṇakya through his pupil directs three Brāhmaṇas, all brothers, to receive the ornaments from Candragupta and see him with the same

All this, he declares, very well forms the latter part of his proposed letter After a little thought he fixes up the earlier part also and it pertains to the five great Mleccha princes, great friends of Rākṣasa He was about to write their names in the letter, but suddenly he changes his mind and chooses to keep the contents only vague Completing the letter he asks his pupil to ask Siddhārthaka to get the letter written by Śakatadāsa without any address thereon and without letting him know that he was doing it for Cāṇakya, and then see him At this stage Cāṇakya is quite confident that now Malayaketu is within his clutches When Siddhārthaka comes with

the letter as directed, Cāṇakya appreciates the beautiful hand of Śakaṭadāsa and asks the former to seal it with the ring (of course, of Rākṣasa) When that is done he further tells him that he should first scare away the executioners and take away Śakatadāsa from the place of execution to Rākṣasa, and receiving a reward from the latter for having rescued his friend, be in his service for some time Then as the enemies approached Kusumapura, he is to do something which Cāṇakya whispers into his ear and is kept a secret at this stage

Having thus settled his future plans for the capture of Malayaketu, Cāṇakya now, on behalf of Candragupta, orders Kālapāśika and Daṇḍapāśika to banish Jīvasiddhi with disgrace on the charge of having killed Parvateśvara with a poison-maiden under the direction of Rākṣasa , and to impale Śakatadāsa, who under instructions from Rākṣasa again has always been encouraging people to plot against the life of Candragupta, and throw all his family into prison Now as Cāṇakya wonders whether Rākṣasa would be captured, Siddhārthaka requests that he has understood all that he was asked to do and that he should be allowed to depart Cāṇakya, thereon, hands over the letter and the signet ring to him and the former leaves the place

In the meanwhile the pupil returns saying that Kālapāśika and Daṇḍapāśika are doing what they are told to do He is then asked to bring Candanadāsa Now this latter has his own suspicions and declares that he has directed Dhanadāsa and others to carry away the family of Rākṣasa to some safer place On knowing of his arrival, Cāṇakya very courteously asks him to take his seat , and with great insistence compels him to do so After preliminary enquiries about his trade Cāṇakya directly asks Candanadāsa whether the defects of Candragupta reminded the people of the good qualities of the former kings On knowing from Candanadāsa that people are far happier under the rule of Candragupta, Cāṇakya declares

that kings also seek some gratification in return, not, however, in the form of money like the former kings, but in the form of absence of affliction, which would result from an attitude not hostile to the king Candanadāsa desires to know who has been suspected of being hostile to the king and is told in plain terms that he is the foremost among such persons, since he is sheltering Rākṣasa's family in his house When Candanadāsa pleads that the charge is baseless, Cāṇakya tells him that it is not their existence in one's house so much as the concealment of that fact that constitutes a crime Thereon the latter tells that the family of Rākṣasa was with him for some time, but that it is not there at the moment and that he is not aware of its whereabouts He is thereon threatened by Cāṇakya Just at this moment a great tumult is heard outside, not once but twice, and on enquiry, it is known that Jīvasiddhi and Śakaṭadāsa, who were plotting against the king, were being led to be severely punished Cāṇakya asks Candanadāsa to be wise enough to save himself and his family from a similar fate by surrendering Rākṣasa's family But inspite of repeated threats Candanadāsa refuses to do so Cāṇakya very highly appreciates this attitude of Candanadāsa, but pretending to be enraged he sends orders to Vijayapāla to imprison Candanadāsa and his family and confiscate his property, and adds that Candragupta would order his execution Candanadāsa is, however, unmoved, for, as he said, his fall is due to some service to a friend and not to some personal misconduct Here Cāṇakya expresses his conviction that Rākṣasa would certainly try to save Candanadāsa and would thus be in his hands

At this stage the pupil brings the news that Siddhārthaka has taken away Śakaṭadāsa from the place of execution Cāṇakya is only glad to find that Siddhārthaka has made a beginning, but outwardly pretends to be angry and directs his pupil to ask Bhāgurāyaṇa to make the necessary arrangements But

he also is found to have run away Then a word is sent to Bhadrabhata and others to catch Bhāgurāyana But the pupil comes to know that even they have absconded, and feels that every thing was going wrong with his preceptor But Cānakya knows the facts behind these events and hence he silently wishes them all good luck, though openly he tries to appease his pupil by assuring him that even if the whole world would be arrayed against him he would not mind it so long as his brain, which helped him to uproot the Nandas, is intact Then he remarks to himself 'Now I have surely caught Rākṣasa like a wild elephant'

ACT II

This act begins with the entrance of a spy of Rāksasa under the disguise of a snake-charmer, who in the course of conversation speaks of his profession as being equal to that of a royal officer or a politician Getting rid of a passer-by who had no access to Rākṣasa's dwelling, he declares that Cānakya and Rākṣasa, consummate politicians both of them, have by their policies made the Goddess of Wealth to waver

Inside we see Rākṣasa seated and attended by a servant He first reproaches Lakṣmī for being indiscriminate in deserting the Nandas for the worthless Maurya He then declares his determination to take away her resort itself by killing Candragupta Then he goes on to explain what steps he has taken upto now and with what end in view While leaving Kusumapura, he has left his wife and children behind at Candanadāsa's place just to see that the efforts of his partisans are not slackened at the idea that Rāksasa has deserted Kusumapura Śakaṭadāsa is stationed in Kusumapura with a huge wealth for helping and encouraging the spies and partisans plotting against the life of Candragupta and getting secret information Jīvasiddhi and others have been employed to cause a split in the enemy's camp and get his news every

moment With this preparation Rākṣasa is quite sure that he would be able to avenge the destruction of the Nanda kings, provided fate is not against him

Just at this moment comes the Kañcukī with a set of ornaments and a message from Malayaketu who has desired Rākṣasa to put them on Rāksasa, much against his will, does so only in due deference to the desire of Malayaketu , and the Kañchukī goes away satisfied

Then Rāksasa asks his attendant to see if any one was waiting to see him , and learns from him that a snake-charmer was there Rāksasa takes this as an ill omen , and asks his man to send him away satisfied The snake-charmer, however, insists that at least a short poem of his be taken to Rāksasa, who on reading it understands its inner significance viz that the snake-charmer is one of his spies who has gathered information from Kusumapura After a little thinking he remembers that it was Virādhagupta , and asks his attendant to bring him in, saying that as he appears to be a good poet he would like to listen to some of his poems

As soon as Virādhagupta greets Rāksasa, the latter suddenly addresses him by his real name, but immediately realizing his mistake turns the name into Virūdhaśmaśru Then dismissing all his attendants he asks him to take his seat The latter also takes his seat and at the desire of the former commences his narration from the siege of Kusumapura by the enemies of Candragupta and Parvateśvara This excites Rāksasa who, soon realizing the situation, is only filled with grief at the remembrance of the great favour of the Nandas he had enjoyed Virādhagupta proceeding tells how Sarvārthasiddhi left Kusumapura by a subterranean passage just to save his subjects from the great hardships inflicted on them by the siege, and how poor Parvateśvara was killed by the poison-maiden directed by him (i e Rāksasa) to Candragupta

This gives a rude shock to Rākṣasa , but he soon recovers himself and asks Virādhagupta to proceed

The latter then narrates how Malayaketu in fright deserted Kusumapura, how Vairocaka, the brother of Parvateśvara, was taken into confidence and installed a king along with Candragupta, and how Cāṇakya declaring that Candragupta would enter the palace of the Nandas at midnight ordered the carpenters to make suitable decorations But Dāruvarman was rather too hasty and had already decorated the outer porch of the palace , and Cāṇakya on knowing this only said that he would receive a proper reward for his diligence Then Cāṇakya declared that Candragupta's entrance would take place exactly at mid-night and at the same time divided the whole kingdom between Candragupta and Vairocaka Here Rākṣasa surmises that by thus dividing the kingdom Cāṇakya must already have arranged for the murder of Vairocaka, and at the same time has managed to wipe off the blame of the murder of Parvateśvara Proceeding further, Virādhagupta tells that Cāṇakya made Vairochaka, all covered in garlands, seated on the female elephant of Candragupta, enter the palace of the Nandas Naturally Dāruvarman mistook him for Candragupta and let the arch fall down In the meanwhile Varvaraka, the driver of Vairocaka's elephant, tried to seize his scimitar which excited the elephant who now increased her speed and brought her driver just in time to die under the falling arch Dāruvarman realized his miscarriage and with an iron bar killed Vairocaka mistaking him for Candragupta, and was himself pelted to death by the angry infantry Rākṣasa, touched to the quick by this tale, asks him about Abhayadatta, the physician , and is told how he also was detected by Cāṇakya and made to drink the poisoned medicine himself He is again told how Pramodaka was suspected owing to his lavishness and was put to death , and how Bībhatsaka and the rest directed to assassinate Candragupta

in his bed-chamber were detected by the astute Cānakya and burnt alive by setting fire to the place where they lay concealed

Rāksasa is moved to tears by this long chain of sorrowful tales and declares that Candragupta has fate on his side, indeed Virādhagupta suggests that it is not proper that Rākṣasa should give up what is once undertaken, and continuing his narration tells how Cāṇakya seized Rākṣasa's partisans as being the source of all mischief Thus Jīvasiddhi has been banished with disgrace, on the charge that he murdered Parvateśvara with the poison-maiden under the direction of Rākṣasa This evokes from Rākṣasa appreciation of Cānakya's policy Śakatadāsa's turn came next, and he has been sentenced to be impaled on the charge that he instigated Dāruvarman and others to plot against Candragupta's life This is a great shock to Rākṣasa, but composing himself he prepares himself to listen to the calamity of a third friend, and is told how Candanadāsa removed Rākṣasa's family to some safer place and refused to surrender the same even when Cānakya asked him to do so under severe threats He is, therefore, thrown into prison with all his family Hearing this Rākṣasa remarks, 'Better say that Rākṣasa himself is thrown into prison with his family'

After this long chain of sorrowful events fortune seems for a while to smile on Rākṣasa and Śakaṭadāsa stands before him with Siddhārthaka who is introduced to him by the former as his rescuer At once Rākṣasa presents him the ornaments from his own person Siddhārthaka, however, seals them with the ring he has received from Cānakya and requests to be allowed to leave them with Rākṣasa only, as he has no acquaintance there His request is readily granted In the meanwhile Śakatadāsa notices that the ring bears the name of Rāksasa who on knowing it asks Siddhārthaka how he got the ring The latter told that he got it at the door of Can-

danadāsa on which Rākṣasa remarks 'Right', and explains his remark to mean that there is nothing improbable in such a ring being found at the door of a merchant like Candanadāsa Then at the desire of Śakatadāsa, Siddhārthaka hands over the ring to Rākṣasa who in his turn hands it over to Śakatadāsa saying that he should use it in future in all his dealings Now Siddhārthaka requests that since it is impossible for him to go back to Cānakya he should be allowed to remain in the service of Rākṣasa only This request is only too gladly granted by Rākṣasa who then asks Śakatadāsa to look to the comfort of Siddhārthaka before they are off the stage

Virādhagupta then informs Rākṣasa of the widening gulf between Candragupta and Cānakya since the escape of Malayaketu This news encourages Rākṣasa who now sends Virādhagupta to Kusumapura to ask Stavakalaśa, Candragupta's bard, to excite Candragupta's anger and send word to him through Karabhaka

Just then a servant comes from Śakatadāsa with a set of three ornaments for sale Rākṣasa very much likes it and at once sends word to Śakatadāsa that the set should be acquired by satisfying the demand of the merchant who has brought it The servant goes away, and Rākṣasa, left to himself, expresses his hope—nay, certainty—that there will be a split between Candragupta and Cānakya since both of them have now accomplished their purpose and no longer stand in need of each other

ACT III

This act begins with the appearance of the Kañcukin on the stage conveying the order of king Candragupta to decorate the upper terrace of the Sugānga palace, so that he from there might witness the city celebrating the Kaumudī festival Somebody asks him whether the prohibition of the festival

was not known to the king , but the Kañcukin refuses to give any reply adding that it is none of their concern

Then appears Candragupta with an attendant In his soliloquy he says that kingship is indeed a source of great worry and that the goddess of wealth is indeed hard to propitiate Then he informs the spectators that he had very reluctantly undertaken to conduct the affairs of the state independently of Cānakya for a while after picking a quarrel with him, according to his own desire Reaching the Sugānga palace and going up there he is enchanted with the beauty of autumn , but is at the same time struck to find no trace of the Kaumudī festival He, therefore, asks the Kañcukin whether he had proclaimed his desire to the citizens, and if so, whether the people of Kusumpura don't care for his desire The latter assures him that his desire or command would never be disobeyed in Kusumpura It is only with great reluctance that he further informs him that the festival was prohibited by Cānakya Candragupta thereon takes his seat and immediately sends for Cānakya

Now Cānakya is seen in his abode thinking about Rākṣasa who, he declares, would better cease vying with him , for the only point of similarity between them two is *vaira* But he is sure that he can check Rāksasa in no time At this juncture the Kañcukin is seen outside the very simple abode of Cānakya Entering there he tells Cānakya that he is invited by the king Cānakya asks whether the king has heard of the prohibition of the festival , and when the Kañcukin answers in the affirmative, he in pretended anger declares that it was the mischief played by the royal officers against him On knowing that the king was in the Sugānga palace, Cānakya guided by the Kañcukin goes there and greets Candragupta who also falls at his feet When they both are properly seated Cānakya asks why he was summoned , and the latter desires to know why the festival was prohibited Not that he wanted

to find fault with him, but that he was sure that Cānakya must have some purpose behind it , and this was what he desires to know But Cānakya points out that Candragupta was completely dependent on his minister in his administration and as such he should not enquire into such affairs This rouses the anger of Candragupta , and the bards also sing verses calculated to enhance his anger Cānakya immediately sees through these verses the hand of Rākṣasa and remarks that he is quite vigilant himself Candragupta, much pleased with the bards, orders that they be given a thousand gold coins But Cānakya disallows such a gift and Candragupta bitterly complains that kingdom to him is nothing better than fetters Cānakya retorts that such was the fate of those who were dependent on their ministers, and asks Candragupta to conduct the administration himself if he can The latter accepts the challenge and asks Cānakya pertinently why he has prohibited the festival Cānakya, however, asks why it was to be performed at all , and when the king says that it was just to obey his order if for nothing else, Cānakya also declares that the prohibition also was just meant to violate the king's order and thereby prove his humility That, however, is not the only purpose Cānakya then asks the Kañcukin to fetch the documents concerning Bhadrabhata and others , who have deserted Candragupta and gone over to Malayaketu When they are brought, Cānakya reads out the names of the persons thus absconded , and Candragupta expresses his desire to know the causes of their disaffection When the causes are told in detail, he asks why they were not checked and imprisoned , and Cānakya assures him that it was not for want of ability, but because that was the right course to follow For neither *anugraha* nor *nigraha* could be adopted in their cases without causing some trouble or another Thus under the guidance of Rākṣasa and aided by Candragupta's own people Malayaketu is preparing to launch an attack against him Time is,

therefore, ripe, concludes Cānakya, not for festivals, but for military exercise That is why he has prohibited the Kaumudī festival even in contravention to the king's order

This, however, does not satisfy Candragupta who now asks why Malayaketu was connived at while absconding from Kusumpura Cānakya in reply points out that there was no other go, for if he were captured that would have proved that they have treacherously killed Parvataka, while giving away the promised half to him would render the murder of Parvataka a sheer treachery without any material advantage But what about Rāksasa? asks Candragupta, and Cānakya replies that staying within the capital he would have caused internal disturbances within, and that even if he creates troubles outside, he can be very easily brought under effective control To capture him per force was, of course, out of the question, for in that attempt he would cause a large scale destruction of Candragupta's army or would perhaps be killed—neither of which consequences is desirable Hearing all this argumentation on the part of Cānakya, Candragupta admits that it would never be possible for him to silence Cānakya by argumentation, and adds that after all he felt Rāksasa to be more esteemable than him Cānakya in anger asks what made him think so, and Candragupta describes his achievements But Cānakya in an ironical tone remarks that he thought that Rāksasa has uprooted Candragupta and enthroned Malayaketu instead, like him But Candragupta now is not willing to give Cānakya even that much credit and remarks that, all that was achieved by fate and not by him And when the latter asserts that only fools believe in fate, the former retorts that the wise also are far from prattling This is more than what Cānakya can bear and in rage he shouts that Candragupta was only playing with fire and courting death Candragupta thought that Cānakya was really angry, but in a moment Cānakya curbs his feigned anger and lays

down the ministerial sword before Candragupta saying that it was no use discussing the matter any further Then to himself he declares that this very plot of Rāksasa he will utilise against him

Cānakya leaves the place in anger and Candragupta asks the Kañcukin to proclaim the dismissal of Cānakya and the assumption of regal authority by himself Kañcukin waits for a while, and, when asked about it, says that he was thinking that Candragupta has now become a king, indeed After he has gone Candragupta calls his attendant and desires to be shown the way to his bed-chamber as he had a bitter headache, and while on the way he makes an open confession that he is extremely ashamed of what has happened and wonders how the heart of people does not break assunder with shame when they really disrespect their preceptor

ACT IV

Act IV begins with Karabhaka going to the dwelling of Rāksasa and asking the door-keeper to inform Rākṣasa of his arrival The door-keeper asks him not to be very loud because Rāksasa, suffering as he is from headache is not yet out of bed

Then we see Rāksasa in his bed-room accompanied by Śakatadāsa, in a pensive mood, thinking of the great hardships that a minister like him is put to like a play-wright! He is just thinking about *wicked Cānakya* when the door-keeper enters with the greeting '*Be Victorious*', and while he is thinking out the remaining portion of his thought viz, '*could be deceived*', the door-keeper is ready with the word '*Rāksasa*' This dramatic irony combined with the throbbing of the left eye forebodes evil for Rāksasa, as he takes it He would not, however, give up his efforts The door-keeper announces the arrival of Karabhaka, and Rāksasa immediately calls him in Karabhaka enters and takes his seat as directed by Rākṣasa who, however, does not remember on what mis-

sion exactly Karabhaka had been sent by him

While Rākṣasa is thus trying to remember the mission entrusted to Karabhaka, on the other side of the stage is seen a servant warding off the people and making room for Malayaketu who is going to see Rāksasa since he is suffering from headache

Then appears on the stage Malayaketu accompanied by Bhāgurāyana and Kañcukin It is ten months since his father died , and he has not yet performed the obsequies in his proud conviction that he would soon be avenging his death Now he asks the Kañcukin to inform the accompanying princes that they should leave him alone, since he desires to see Rāksasa alone Then he asks the Kāñchukin and other attendants also to leave the place

When he finds himself alone with Bhāgurāyana, Malayaketu asks the latter what Bhadrabhata and others meant when they told him that they wanted to remmain in his services not through Rāksasa but through the commander, Śikharasena Bhāgurāyana tells him that they meant to say that Rāksasa had enmity with Cānakya (and not Candragupta), so that it is not unlikely that if for some reason or the other Cānakya is dismissed, Rāksasa may join Candragupta In that case they would be losing Malayaketu's confidence if they have joined through Rāksasa But this risk they are not prepared to run Malayaketu approves of this explanation and they both are about to enter the abode of Rāksasa, when the latter remembers the mission on which Karabhaka had been sent and asks him whether he had seen Stavakalaśa in Kusumapura When Malayaketu overhears this question put by Rāksasa to Karabhaka he decides to wait outside and listen to the talk between them, thinking that their talk would not be quite open and frank if he is with them

Then Rākṣasa asks Karabhaka whether his mission is successful and the latter answers in the affirmative Malayaketu

is curious to know what the mission might be, but Bhāgurāyana tells him that they would be able to know it by-the-bye in the course of the talk going on inside

Now Rākṣasa expresses his desire to listen to the whole account at full length and Karabhaka tells that he at the command of Rākṣasa went to Pātaliputra and delivered his instructions to Stavakalaśa In the meanwhile Candragupta had ssued orders to celebrate the Kaumudī festival, the people also were very eager to do so, but Cāṇakya prohibited the same for reasons of his own Stavakalaśa took this opportunity and sang songs calculated to excite Candragupta Karabhaka recites those songs to Rākṣasa who is very highly pleased thereby and feels sure that this seed of dissension would soon bear its fruits This remark of Rākṣasa, of course, strengthens Malayaketu's suspicions and he remarks '*Evam etat*' Then Karabhaka proceeding tells how Candragupta praised Rakṣasa's qualities and dismissed Cāṇakya Bhāgurāyana impresses on the mind of Malayaketu the dismissal of Cāṇakya as an important gesture on the part of Candragupta Now Rākṣasa asks Karabhaka whether there was any other cause which roused Candragupta's anger towards Cāṇakya Bhāgurāyana misrepresenting this to Malayaketu said that Rākṣasa wants to make sure that the gulf between Candragupta and Cāṇakya is rather too wide so that their re-union would be out of the question Karabhaka tells that the other matter rousing Candragupta's anger was that Cāṇakya allowed Malayaketu and Rākṣasa to escape Rākṣasa is now quite sure that Candragupta can very easily be conquered and says that Candragupta was now in his hands, and that soon Candanadāsa would be released and would be re-united with his wife and children Malayaketu is rather doubtful about the first remark of Rākṣasa, and Bhāgurāyana tells him that Rākṣasa would not destroy Candragupta if dissociated from Cāṇakya Rākṣasa then asks where Cāṇakya was, and whether he has not gone

to a penance-grove or taken a vow again Karabhaka in reply tells that there was a rumour to that effect Rākṣasa then turns to Śakatadāsa and remarks that this does not appear probable, for Cānakya would never stand an insult at the hands of one whom he himself has created a king Malayaketu here is interested in knowing why Rākṣasa is interested in Cānakya's repairing to the penance-grove or taking a vow, and is told by Bhāgurāyana that it is evidently because Rākṣasa's purpose would be served to the extent to which Cānakya will be separated from Candragupta Now Śakatadāsa tells Rākṣasa that it was but natural that Candragupta could not tolerate any violation of his orders and at the same time that Cānakya did not take a vow again as he is now quite conscious of the great hardship involved in the fulfilment thereof Rākṣasa is convinced and asks Śakatadāsa to look to the comfort of Karabhaka

When they are gone Rākṣasa expresses his desire to see Malayaketu, and the latter enters into his presence declaring that he himself has come to see him After mutual greetings when they are seated Malayaketu enquires about Rākṣasa's headache and the latter replies that it won't subside unless and until the former becomes an *adhirāja* Malayaketu expresses his confidence that it would take place very soon, and desires to know how long they would be required to wait before they get an opportunity to attack the enemy Rākṣasa tells him that now there was no time to be lost and that he should at once lead an expedition against Candragupta, for a contingency has now befallen him The contingency pertains to the minister and is a very serious one for Candragupta who is completely dependent on his minister But Malayaketu thinks that people hate the arrogance of Cānakya, and his dismissal would please people whose loyalty to Candragupta would be all the deeper on that account Rākṣasa, however, points out that what Malayaketu said applied to only such a section of

people as owe their rise to Candragupta The rest of them, however, bear only a strong hatred for Candragupta as the extirpator of the Nanda race, so that they are sure to side with an enemy of Candragupta, particularly when they find him strong enough to defeat him Has not Rāksasa himself done it? Malayaketu now wants to know whether there is any other contingency facing the enemy, and is told that there was no need to think about any other contingency since the one partaining to the minister is the most important, particularly for Candragupta who is so completely dependent on his minister that he won't be able to conduct the affairs of the state by himself or even by appointing any other minister in the place of Cānakya Here Malayaketu feels glad that he is not so much dependent on his minister But, Malayaketu adds, our success will be doubly ensured if Candragupta is confronted with more contingencies than one Rāksasa, however, puts forth all the strong points on his side and assures Malayaketu that their success was absolutely certain, and that it is for him only to desire for it Malayaketu then declares that if that is so he would at once start the expedition, and leaves the stage along with Bhāgurāyana

Rāksasa then asks his servant to see if any astrologer was available, and he is told that a Ksapanaka was there But as he was badly in need of one, he asks the servant to bring him in, but with a not inauspicious appearance When the monk is brought in and had greeted Rākṣasa, the latter requests him to give him a day for starting an expedition The monk gives the full-moon day as the best day from various astronomical considerations, and when Rāksasa says that the *tithi* is not quite auspicious, the former points out that the *naksatra* and the *lagna* are four and twenty-four times respectively as powerful as the *tithi* He further advises Rākṣasa to start his expedition on the support of the (favourable) Candra and derive great advantage Rākṣasa, however, asks the monk

to consult other astrologers which he refuses to do, saying that Rāksasa himself might do it if he likes, and when Rākṣasa asks him whether he was enraged, he answers that it was not he, but the god of Death, that was enraged with him The monk then leaves the place, and Rākṣasa from his attendant knows that it was sunset, looking at which Rāksasa observes that as a general rule servants desert a master fallen from glory

PRAVEŚAKA IN ACT V

Siddhārthaka is seen with a letter and an ornament-casket both sealed with Rāksasa's ring The former was handed over to him by Cānakya, as we have already seen, and the latter, it may be remembered, is the one which Siddhārthaka himself had deposited with Rāksasa under his seal With these he now intends to go to Kusumapura Seeing the monk in front of him he feels that it is an ill omen, but he does not avoid the monk since he wants to know from him whether the day is auspicious The monk also rebukes him by remarking that he was enquiring after the naksatra after he had shaved himself But Siddhārthaka tells him that if the day is not good he may even now cancel his programme for the day Then the monk declares that in Malayaketu's camp conditions are not favourable for the time being, particularly because all movements to and from the camp are now restricted and none was allowed to go out or to come in without the *mudrā* of Bhāgurāyana Siddhārthaka tells the monk that he was Rāksasa's man, but the latter at once remarks that even then he won't be allowed to leave the camp if he has not got the *mudrā* of Bhāgurāyana But Siddhārthaka requests the monk to say that he will be successful in his mission, and the latter also does accordingly and goes away to get Bhāgurāyana's mudrā for himself

ACT V

This act begins with Bhāgurāyana ordering his attendant to bring to him any one that may be seeking to obtain *mudrā* from him He also expresses regret that he should be required to deceive the affable Malayaketu But he is helpless in this matter, he adds

At this stage appears on the stage Malayaketu thinking to himself about Rākṣasa and his future action, and on knowing that Bhāgurāyana was nearby giving *mudrās* to those who want to go out, he makes up his mind to play a joke with him But as he is about to do so, Bhāgurāyana's attendant brings in the monk seeking *mudrā* Bhāgurāyana recognizes him as a friend of Rākṣasa, Jīvasiddhi by name, and gives him the *mudrā* on making sure that he is not going on Rākṣasa's errand The latter expresses great contempt for Rākṣasa and in reply to a querry from Bhāgurāyana declares, with great reluctance to all appearances, that previously Rākṣasa killed Parvateśwara through a poison-maiden, and he had to suffer for it, for he was banished by Cānakya with disgrace from Kusumapura as a friend of Rākṣasa This gives a rude shock to Malayaketu who upto now was under the impression that Cānakya had killed his father Bhāgurāyana then asks what he had to say about the rumour that Cānakya had killed Parvatesvara to avoid giving him the promised half of the kingdom, and the latter asserts that it was all a lie Now Bhāgurāyana is satisfied and gives the *mudrā* to the monk What he has heard is now certainly more than what Malayaketu could bear, and hence moving into the presence of Bhāgurāyana he declares that what he has heard has doubly deepened his sorrow The purpose of the monk, who is only a spy of Cānakya, is thus served and he goes away expressing his satisfaction at what has taken place

Malayaketu now deeply affected declares that Rākṣasa is really a *rākṣasa* (a demon) in that he has proved treacherous to one who placed full confidence in him This remark of Malayaketu roused Bhāgurāyaṇa's apprehensions and he told the former that it was not quite wrong on the part of Rākṣasa to kill Parvateśvara, who was then stronger than Candragupta himself, for, Rākṣasa then wanted to install Sarvārthasiddhi on the throne So it is better not to take him to task for the present and accept his services till the kingdom of the Nandas is obtained Malayaketu approves of this suggestion of Bhāgurāyaṇa, for he thinks that the execution of a minister like Rākṣasa would lead to great commotion, thus making his victory doubtful

Just at this stage Siddhārthaka is brought a captive before Malayaketu in an attempt to escape from the camp with a letter, but without *mudrā* When it is revealed that he was in the service of Rākṣasa, Bhāgurāyaṇa asks him why he was thus going without *Mudrā* Siddhārthaka replies that the importance of his mission brooked no delay, and Bhāgurāyaṇa desires to know what the mission is At Malayaketu's command he also takes the letter from him and finding that it bore Rākṣasa's seal, opens it keeping the seal intact It is found that the letter is only vaguely worded, though the following points are referred to in it (i) The addressee has kept his word by dismissing the rival of the writer (i e Rākṣasa), (ii) he is requested to fulfil his promise to the friends of the writer and win their good-will, (iii) the addressee is reminded that some of them want the territory of the enemy and the rest desire to have his *kośa* and *hastibala*, (iv) he is also given an assurance that they will, in return, help him by destroying their resort i e Master, (v) the set of ornaments sent by the addressee is duly received and the writer also has sent some thing to accompany the letter with a request that it should be accepted by him, (vi) the oral message will be

delivered by the bearer of the letter, the most trusted Siddhārthaka

After a good flogging Siddhārthaka drops from his arm-pit a casket of ornaments which is taken by the servant to Bhāgurāyana It also bears the seal of Rāksasa, and when it is opened before Malayaketu, it is found to contain the ornaments which Malayaketu had presented to Rāksasa on a previous occasion Malayaketu is, therefore, convinced that the letter must be addressed to Candragupta After a good flogging again Siddhārthaka agrees to tell the whole thing to Malayaketu himself, and requests to be excused in the matter After an assurance to that effect from Malayaketu, Siddhārthaka tells that Rāksasa has sent him with the letter to Candragupta and the oral message that the kings of the Kulūtas, Malaya, and Kāśmīra desire to have Malayaketu's territory, while those of Sindhu and Pārasīka desire to have his elephants and treasury, and that just as Candragupta had won his pleasure by dismissing Cānakya, similarly now he should win the pleasure of these princes by accomplishing their desire This narration of Siddhārthaka is readily believed by Malayaketu who sees in it an explanation of the strong friendship which these kings had with Rāksasa He now sends for Rāksasa

Rāksasa is seated in his house, full of concern at the idea that his army is mostly made up of deserters of Candragupta But he satisfies himself by arguing that that should cause no anxiety, for these deserters were persons who had real disaffection for Candragupta and had accepted his own overtures before Rāksasa then sends Priyamvadaka to tell the kings that it was now time for them to march in different directions according to the previously settled plan

Just then the door-keeper informs Rāksasa that Malayaketu desires to see him, and Rākṣasa, thinking that it would be improper on his part to go to Malayaketu without putting on

any ornament, sends word to Śakaṭadāsa to send one of the ornaments that he has bought for him When the ornament is brought, Rāksasa puts it on and starts for the camp of Malayaketu, thinking to himself how an officer, though above all guilt, always stands in great apprehension

After mutual greetings Malayaketu tells Rāksasa that he was rather ill at ease since he could not see him for a long time On hearing from Rāksasa that he was engaged in planning the counter-move, Malayaketu expresses his desire to know the plan of counter-action, and Rāksasa gives out his plan as settled before But Malayaketu is struck to find that the very kings who were reported to be plotting against him were to surround him according to Rāksasa's plan He, however, suppresses his misgivings and asks Rāksasa if any one has come from or gone to Kusumapura But when the latter asserts that now there was no need for doing so, for in a short while they themselves will be going there, Malayaketu's misgiving is confirmed and he asks why Rākṣasa has then sent Siddhārthaka with a letter Being questioned by Rāksasa, Siddhārthaka pretends to be ashamed and declares that being heavily flogged he found it impossible to keep the secret Rākṣasa, on hearing this, is only confused and asks what secret he was referring to But when he gave no reply to this, on Malayaketu's direction Bhāgurāyana tells Rāksasa that Siddhārthaka has stated that Rāksasa himself has sent him with a letter and an oral message to Candragupta Siddhārthaka confesses to have done so on heavy flogging, and Rāksasa avers that it was all false and that a man when flogged may say any thing Then is produced the letter, which also Rāksasa declares to be only an enemy's trick But what about the ornaments, asks Malayaketu, producing the ornaments recovered from Siddhārthaka Rākṣasa recognizes these ornaments and tells that he has presented them to Siddhārthaka But, Bhāgurāyana remarks, it is very improper on Rākṣasa's part to give away to

Siddhārthaka the ornaments which Malayaketu had presented to him from his own person Then Malayaketu refers to the oral message and Rāksasa says that when the letter itself is not his, it is but evident that there can be no oral message either It is further brought to the notice of Rāksasa that the letter bore his seal But he replied that it must be a counterfeit seal Then Bhāgurāyana turns to Siddhārthaka and asks him who has written the letter, and under threats of being flogged again it was that Siddhārthaka revealed that it was written by Śakatadāsa But Rāksasa avers that a letter written by Śakatadāsa is as good as written by himself Malayaketu desires to see Śakatadāsa himself in this connection, but Bhāgurāyana suggests that the matter could be settled by comparing the hand in the letter to that of Śakatadāsa Śakatadāsa's writing and seal were, therefore, brought and it was found that the letter was in Śakatadāsa's hand, indeed This confounds Rāksasa who wonders whether Śkatadāāsa has proved faithless Then Malayaketu points to the ornament on the person of Rāksasa and asks him whether that was one of those referred to in the letter Looking at it more carefully, he recognizes it as belonging to his father and then asks from whom it was received Rāksasa tells that he has bought it, but when he hears from Malayaketu that it belonged to his father, Rāksasa declares that it was also a trap set by Cānakya But Malayaketu now refuses to believe in Rāksasa's word and a little later sarcastically remarks that there was truth in Rāksasa's declaration and that the price for the ornament to be paid to Candragupta was his (Malayaketu's) very life The evidence against Rāksasa is so overwhelming that he now thinks it better to confess to the guilt than say anything else, and when Malayaketu addresses him as *ārya,* Rāksasa says that he was no longer an *ārya* As regards the letter and the casket of ornaments Rāksasa declares that it was only the working of fate But Malayaketu is so much incensed

that he addresses Rākṣasa an *anārya* and tells him that it was all the working of avarice, and that he was treacherously handing him over to the enemy for getting his ministership, just as treacherously as he had killed the confiding Parvateśvara by a poison-maiden Rākṣasa denies this latter charge and when Malayaketu makes a reference to Kṣapaṇaka Jīvasiddhi in this connection as a witness, Rākṣasa is simply astounded Malayaketu now has not the least doubt about Rākṣasa's meanness in hatching plots against him and orders the several kings, his allies, to be put to death instantaneously, and allows Rākṣasa to go to Candragupta, adding that he is not mean-minded like him He also declares that he is strong enough to defeat all the enemies single-handed At Bhāgurāyana's suggestion Malayaketu leaves the place to start his expedition against Kusumapura , and Rākṣasa, now left alone, laments that all his plans should only result in the destruction of his own friends rather than that of his enemies 'What to do next ?' is the most important question , and after some thought he decides to try to release Candanadāsa from the clutches of Cānakya, and leaves the place

PRAVEŚAKA IN ACT VI

Siddhārthaka sees his friend Samiddhārthaka and at his request tells him that Malayaketu has banished Rākṣasa and killed Citravarman and others , and that Malayaketu himself is captured by Bhadrabhaṭa and others Then the whole of the Mleccha army has been captured by Cānakya Samidhārthaka asks whether Cānakya has again resumed his duties as Candragupta's minister Siddhārthaka, however, simply tells that even Rākṣasa himself is unable to fathom the policy of Cānakya He further tells him that Rākṣasa has now come to Pāṭaliputra, as is reported by a spy, Udumbara Siddhārthaka conjectures that he has come here for the sake of Candanadāsa who, however, according to Cānkya's order is to be executed

by them both under the disguise of Cāndālas Samiddhārthaka resents this order, but Siddhārthaka tells him that none who wants to remain alive dare violate the order of Cānakya So they both decide to take up the garb of Cāndālas and lead Candanadāsa to the place of execution

ACT VI

A man with a rope in hand tells us that he has come to the place where he has been directed by Cānakya to see Rāksasa Looking about him he finds Rāksasa nearby, his face veiled and coming up towards him He, therefore, conceals himself behind the trees there and keeps a watch on Rāksasa

Rāksasa then enters voicing his charges against the Goddess of Wealth and at the same time adding that it is fate, and not the Brāhmana, that is the real enemy of the Nanda race He even blames Malayaketu for being so blind and indiscriminate But he would prefer to die rather than make peace with Candragupta Then he looks about him and enters the *jīrnodyāna* with a view to get some news about his friend, Candanadāsa Mourning for a while about the sharp contrast of his present condition with that in the past he sits on a slab of stone While seated there he hears a sound of trumpets mixed with that of drums and conches, and infers that it was the rejoicings of the enemy at the capture of Malayaketu

The man seeing Rākṣasa seated there, hangs himself just in front of him in obedience to the instructions of Cānakya On seeing this Rāksasa enquires about the whole matter and in a series of questions and answers comes to know that the man was hanging himself just to avoid hearing the news of the death of his friend Visnudāsa, who was going to burn himself alive before he heard of the execution of his dear friend, Candanadāsa The man also tells how Candanadāsa incurred the wrath of Cānakya by refusing to surrender the wife and children of Rāksasa, and how Cānakya refused to deliver

him for any amount whatever Rākṣasa in great concern wants to know that Candanadāsa is not yet executed, and learns that he is to be executed just that day Rākṣasa is very deeply touched by the magnanimity of Candanadāsa and asks the man to prevent Viṣṇudāsa from burning himself since he would save Candanadāsa with his sword But the man on knowing that he was Rākṣasa himself, tells him courteously that such an attempt on his part would only hasten Candanadāsa's execution For since Śakaṭadāsa's absconding led to the execution of the executioners themselves, the executioners, whenever they notice any armed person nearby, immediately execute the culprit just for their own lives if for nothing else Rākṣasa is here thrown into great confusion, but ultimately concludes that he would offer himself as ransom to release his friend Candanadāsa

ACT VII

This act begins with one cāṇḍāla appearing on the stage and declaring the deadly consequences of *rājāpathya* and pointing to the case of Candanadāsa as an illustration

Then comes Candanadāsa lamenting that he should meet with an end befitting a thief He is also grieved at the idea that even friends like Viṣṇudāsa should desert him at this stage, and that others who have not done so should do nothing better than look at him with tearful eyes When they are at the place of execution, the Cāṇḍāla requests Candanadāsa to bid farewell to the members of his family Candanadāsa asks his wife to return with her son, but with tears in her eyes she declines to do so, since he was going to the other world Candanadāsa tries to cheer her up by saying that he is dying for a friend But she affirms that she would follow him in his death He again reminds her of her son for whom at least she must live, but she is prepared to leave her son to the care of the household deities and asks him to bow to his

father for the last time The son doing so asks what he should do, bereft of his father, and Candanadāsa very frankly tells him, 'Stay in a place where Cānakya has no sway'

In the meanwhile the stake is erected and the Cāndālas ask Candanadāsa to be ready At this Candanadāsa's wife raises a cry for help and Candanadāsa tries to appease her by pointing out that since he was dying for a friend and not for any personal crime she should rather smile than weep The second Cāndāla now grows rather impatient and asks his fellow-brother to seize Candanadāsa so that his wife and son would return of their own accord As the Cāndāla is about to catch hold of him, Candanadāsa asks him to wait a bit, and embracing his son tells him again that he was meeting his end in a friend's cause, and the son also remarks that it was but their *kula-dharma* Then the Cāṇdālas seize Candanadāsa and his wife begins to weep piteously and cry for help

Rākṣasa hastily appears on the stage and in an assuring tone requests Candanadāsa's wife to be calm, and asks the Cāndālas not to execute Candanadāsa He asks them to place the culprit's garland on his own neck Candanadāsa with tears in his eyes asks Rāksasa what he has done, and the latter replies that he has only partially imitated his good deed But Candanadāsa repeats his question pointing out that this action on the part of Raksasa has frustrated all his endeavours But Rākṣasa again declares that he has acted only in self-interest, and asks the Cāndālas to inform Cānakya that Rākṣasa is captured The Cāndāla requests somebody there to take to Cānakya, the thunderbolt of the mountain of the Nanda race, the founder of the Maurya race, the news that minister Rākṣasa is captured and that his policies and talent are circumscribed by the former's policy

Here Cānakya's face is seen, his body screened behind the

curtain He asks who has achieved all the difficult tasks and when the Cāndāla attributes the achievements to him, he declines to take any credit to himself and plainly attributes it to the misfortune of the Nandas Rāksasa also appreciates the magnanimity of Cānakya here, and he also shows his appreciation of the qualities of the former as a politician Then Cānakya tosses aside the curtain and pays homage to Rāksasa Now comes the denouement and Cānakya reveals to Rāksasa that the two Cāndālas were none but Siddhārthaka and Samiddhārthaka, his spies, and that Śakatadāsa was made to write that mischievous letter without being aware that he was doing it Every thing including the letter, the set of ornaments, the monk, the man in the *jīrnodyāna*, even Bhadrabhata and others and lastly the imprisonment of Candanadāsa—all that was nothing but a trap laid by him, reveals Cānakya, to win over Rāksasa to Candragupta

Candragupta, arriving there, bows down to Cānakya who asks him to bow to Rākṣasa, the premier Candragupta does accordingly and Rāksasa also greets him in return Then Cānakya asks Rāksasa whether he really desires to save the life of his friend, and tells him that if he really did it, he can do it only on the condition that he agrees to be the minister of Candragupta Rāksasa pleads his incompetence to wield a position so ably held by no less a person than Cānakya himself But the latter warns Rāksasa that there was no other way of saving Candanadāsa's life Rāksasa, therefore, accepts the condition In the meanwhile Malayaketu is brought a captive, but Cānakya now points to Rāksasa who, of course, suggests that Malayaketu should be set free Cānakya thereon declares that Candragupta is pleased to restore to Malayaketu his paternal territory, and asks Bhadrabhata and others to see that he is properly reinstated Candanadāsa is raised to the position of *sarva-nagara-śresthin*, and all prisoners are set free Cānakya then ties his hair and asks Candragupta and

Rākṣasa what other favour they would like to have from him , and Candragupta expresses his complete satisfaction at what has happened, while Rākṣasa only adds that the ruling king Candragupta might rule long

CHAPTER III

A CRITICAL APPRECIATION

PROLOGUE

Like every other Sanskrit play the Mudrā-rākṣasa also begins with a nāndī and a prologue According to Sanskrit canon a nāndī[1] consists of a verse or two purporting to invoke a blessing from and offer obeisance to some deity and to suggest the main idea of the plot, of course, only indirectly It is so called because it is believed that deities take delight in it The nāndī of our play comprises two verses in the sragdharā metre describing the śāṭhya and the tāṇḍava nṛtya of God Śiva (vibhu and tripuravijayin) respectively and invoke his blessings The Śāṭhya of God Śiva very well suggests the śāṭhya (i e the crooked policy) of the all powerful Cāṇakya Similarly the various limitations set by Cāṇakya to himself in the accomplishment of his task and also the difficulty thereof is clearly reflected in the tāṇḍava nṛtya of God Śiva who is represented in the second stanza as performing it under various limitations caused by the local conditions The end of the play also seems to be suggested by these stanzas by representing the śāṭhya as getting the upper hand and also by the epithet tripuravijayī as applied to God Śiva

Technically prologue is the name given to the introductory portion of every Sanskrit play According to the definition[2] a prologue consists of a striking conversation between the Sūtradhāra on the one hand and the naṭī, or the vidūṣaka, or the pāripārśvaka on the other, concerning some pertinent matter but at the same time suggestive of the plot of the play to some extent The prologue may be said to serve more

purposes than one Thus it introduces the author and also his play by giving their names and some more information regarding the pedigree of the author It also rouses the interest of the spectators and captures their attention by introducing music or by some such device and ultimately very cleverly leads on to the plot itself Besides all this it also gives the shrewd audience an inkling of some incidents of the plot itself The prologue of our play will be found to be quite upto the mark in every respect It not only supplies us with some information regarding the author and his pedigree and also the name of the play, but at the same time rouses our interest by the promise of music which, of course, is superseded by the more interesting scene of a large number of ladies very busily engaged in various preparations The interest thus roused is sustained by the mention of the rumour about the moon-eclipse in a stanza[3] with *double entendre* which is utilized for introducing the main character on the stage, thus making the beginning of the play proper We thus see that the prologue in a lucid conversation rouses the interest and captivates the attention of the spectators and introduces to them the poet and his play

Brevity is another good point to be noted about the prologue of our play It is but natural that the spectators should go impatient if the poet, forgetting the limits of a prologue, introduces in it a number of impertinent and irrelevant matters and makes it unnecessarily lengthy In fact it is the business of every playwright to see that his prologue is short and to the point Happily enough Viśākhadatta has shown his sense of propriety by scrupulously avoiding in his prologue the introduction of any such matter and thus making it short and sweet

Even a casual reader of the Mudrā-rāksasa will hardly fail to notice the influence of the Mrcchakatika and the Cārudatta on Viśākhadatta As in those plays so also here we see

how the Sūtradhāra, turning homeward after music, finds preparations being made and eagerly asks what the occasion was Viśākhadatta has, however, studiously avoided the temptation to copy all the humour which Śūdraka and Bhāsa have created out of the situation That would not only have made his prologue too lengthy but would at the same time have marred the seriousness of the atmosphere which was so absolutely essential for the appearance of the enraged Cāṇakya on the stage

According to writers on dramaturgy Prastāvanā is of five different kinds[4] Very often it is more difficult than otherwise to say definitely to which of these five varieties a particular prastāvanā belongs Thus the prastāvanā of our play has been said to be of the prayogātiśaya[5] kind According to others it is of the kathodghāta[6] type because we find therein Cāṇakya appearing on the stage, taking his cue from the words of the Sūtradhāra Nor are champions of avalagita[7] and the pravartaka[7] types wanting But we may, on the authority of Viśvanātha,[8] put it down as belonging to the udghātyaka variety inasmuch as therein we see Cāṇakya interpreting the words of the Sūtradhāra in his own way and thus coming on the stage

The prastāvanā may also be found to be suggestive The Sūtradhāra turning homewards finds the women-folk extremely busy in several ways This suggests how the two ministers with all their team of spies are extremely busy with their plans and counter-plans St 5[9] where the Sūtradhāra calls his wife nītividyā may be said to suggest the dominance of political intrigue in the play while the sixth[10] stanza with its *double entendre* is clearly indicative of the main plot of the play in general viz that Rākṣasa allied with Malayaketu is trying to overpower per force Candragupta now at the height of prosperity, but that the latter's conjunction with the shrewd Cāṇakya foils all the plans of Rākṣasa and thus Candragupta is saved

ACT I

The Mudrā-rākṣasa holds a unique position in the whole of Sanskrit dramatic literature in having a mainly political theme It begins in an atmosphere befitting the seriousness of the plot , and the spectator is at once taken into the very heart of the plot when Cāṇakya in his monologue acquaints him with his recent achievement, his further aim, and the various means that he has devised for its achievement

Viśākhadatta has very cleverly given the spectator an idea of the situation by making Cāṇakya express his concern at the spreading of the report of the alliance of Rākṣasa with Malayaketu against Candragupta , and further making him boast of his past achievement viz , the extermination of the Nandas and the establishment of Candragupta on the throne, which ultimately leads him to declare his main and immediate aim hereafter viz , the winning over of Rākṣasa into the service of Candragupta, particularly because he is possessed of prajñā, vikrama and bhakti together This naturally leads Cāṇakya to declare what measures he has taken to achieve this aim of his On coming to know the various measures taken by Cāṇakya, the spectator is sure to be struck with the political acumen of Cāṇakya This monologue of Cāṇakya is thus very important as testifying to the skill shown by Viśākhadatta in making the spectator acquainted with various circumstances, which form the back-ground of the plot of his play He has also very cleverly brought out some of the salient features of the character of Cāṇakya such as his political acumen, his self-confidence, his wrathful nature, and also his appreciative nature even towards his enemies

While Cāṇakya is thus indulging in his monologue inside his house, we see a spy standing outside at his door and seeking entrance The conversation between the spy and Cāṇakya's pupil is a specimen of fine humour and serves as a sort of foil

for the serious monologue that has preceded and the dialogue, concerning serious matters again, that is to follow It is by the use of contrast and such other devices that Viśākhadatta has succeeded in sustaining the interest of his spectators Even humour, however, is not allowed to transgress its proper limits and is brought to an end by Cānakya overhearing the conversation outside, particularly the last portion thereof, and asking the spy to enter Here again has Viśākhadatta very cleverly shown Cānakya's alertness and sharp memory by making him remember immediately the name of the spy and the duty that he had entrusted to him This presents a good contrast to the character of Rākṣasa as we shall see later on

Next comes the narration of various important matters by the spy In a dramatic composition, long narration is rather unnatural, and hence Viśākhadatta has cleverly made Cānakya pass various remarks at various intervals These remarks of Cānakya thus serve a double purpose, for besides breaking the monotony of the narration, they reveal certain traits of Cānakya's character and also his working Thus we see how Cānakya has managed his spies with such care that they do not know one another [11] Cānakya's alertness and also his self-confidence become evident from his remark about the kāyastha Śakatadāsa [12] But his remark when he receives Rākṣasa's seal ring from his spy, clearly shows how Cānakya can in no time look into the future and very accurately too [13] The last remark[14] of Cānakya, when he allows his spy to go, shows that he was far from being sentimental It may be observed how Viśākhadatta has very cleverly introduced the ring—the ring that has given its name to the play at least partially—very innocently and roused the interest of the spectator as to how it would be used by Cānakya for winning over Rākṣasa This interest is further heightened when Cānakya orders his pupil to bring ink and paper and declares that he would now write a letter by which Rākṣasa is sure to be won over

The entrance of the pratīnarī just at this juncture with a request from Candragupta to be allowed to perform the obsequies of Parvateśvara and give away his ornaments to Brāhmanas, and the reply given to it by Cānakya bear ample testimony to Viśākhadatta's dramatic skill and sense of economy For this incident supplies Cānakya with material for the latter part of his letter, and he very soon hits upon the material for the earlier part also after a little thought Shrewd as he is, Cānakya almost on the spur of the moment decides to leave the wording of his letter only vague[15] Quickness of judgment possessed by Cānakya is also seen when he immediately sends his pupil with proper instructions to Siddhārthaka to get the letter written by Śakatadāsa (of course with a very plausible excuse[16]) and see him with it When Siddhārthaka comes with the letter in the hand of Śakatadāsa, Cānakya passes an appreciative remark about the hand of Śakatadāsa, and gets it sealed with the ring of Rākṣasa which he has recently secured He also gives Siddhārthaka detailed instructions as to how he is to run away with Śakatadāsa after setting him free from the impaling station, and receiving a present from Rākṣasa for having saved his dear friend, serve him only for some time Cānakya then whispers something into the ear of Siddhārthaka to tell him what he is to do when the enemy is near the capital This is sure to rouse the curiosity of the spectator which, however, is not to be satisfied until almost the end of the drama Before Siddhārthaka leaves the stage, Cānakya sends orders through his pupil (of course, on behalf of Candragupta) to banish Jīvasiddhi with disgrace for having murdered Parvataka with a poison-maiden, and to impale Śakatadāsa and imprison his relatives The pupil goes away and Cānakya is thinking whether his plan would succeed when Siddhārthaka asks permission to leave, and Cānakya allows him to go after handing over to him the letter and the seal ring[17] Here we see how Siddhārthaka is made to remain idle

on the stage for some time while Cānakya is sending away his pupil with proper instructions Viśākhadatta is here guilty of being undramatic simply owing to his craze for the patākāsthāna of which we have in this play several instances The importance of this order sent through his pupil by Cānakya can be realized only when we see how it is utilized to give a threat to Candanadāsa only a few minutes later But when Cānakya asks himself whether after all this Rāksasa would be captured, our curiosity is roused as to how these events would be utilized by Cānakya in fulfilling his aim

Having thus dealt with two of the three adversaries mentioned by the spy, Cānakya now turns his attention to the third and asks his pupil to fetch him Now Candanadāsa and Cānakya's pupil are seen on the road near the house of Cānakya In his very first remark Candanadāsa reveals his view about Cānakya (and his view is right) and also his shrewdness by appraising the situation and quickly arranging for the removal of Rāksasa's family from his abode This scene between Cānakya and Candanadāsa is very interesting indeed, displaying as it does Cānakya's cleverness in the art of eliciting information from others and also in the art of questioning, and his sternness, on the one hand and Candanadāsa's simplicity coupled with a staunchness of friendship and purpose, nay his extra-ordinary boldness and fearlessness in the cause of a friend on the other In the course of conversation Candanadāsa once declares that the charge that he was hiding Rāksasa's family in his house was all baseless but later on falling a victim to Cānakya's remark, says that Rāksasa's family was with him sometime before Cānakya at once catches him at this and orders him forthwith to surrender the family of Rāksasa Just at this moment a noise is heard outside on the road, not once but twice, and Cānakya each time orders his pupil to see what it was all about, though he knows full well that the noise was caused by the fact that Jīvasiddhi was being

banished with disgrace and that Śakaṭadāsa was being led to the impaling station The news brought in by the pupil is utilised by Cāṇakya for threatening Candanadāsa with severe punishment for being unfriendly towards Candragupta like the two offenders who were now being punished and thus inducing him to save himself and his family by surrendering the family of Rākṣasa [18] This threat on the part of Cāṇakya, however, calls forth a boldness from Candanadāsa who in very definite terms strongly refuses to surrender Rākṣasa s family [19] At the end of this scene Cāṇakya tells us how this would result in the capture of Rākṣasa [20] But certain matters have been introduced in this Act (e g the letter and the ring) and the spectator would like to know how they would be utilised by Cāṇakya in achieving his object This, of course, would be clear as the play advances In this Act, however, Viśākhadatta has given us the main point of the play and also the main device by which it is going to be achieved

The Act ends with pieces of news which are apparently rather disconcerting to Cāṇakya, but which in fact are the sign of Cāṇakya's plot being on its wheels, and form the logical outcome of what has preceded

Thus we see that Act I may fall into various scenes economically and logically well arranged so as to give the spectator a good idea of the main aim of Cāṇakya and the main device by which he would have it fulfilled It, at the same time, brings out the salient traits of the characters of Cāṇakya and Candanadāsa , and by giving out certain details helps to rouse and sustain the interest of the spectator The element of contrast also has been properly used and no speech therein is allowed to be undramatically lengthy The end of the Act also is highly dramatic, indeed, because when, on knowing from the pupil about the absconding of a large number of his people Cāṇakya dramatically[21] tells Rākṣasa that he now can't escape from his clutches, the spectator wonders that Cāṇakya

would do further and how the absconding of all these persons would be utilised in capturing Rākṣasa

ACT II

Act II in many respects presents a striking parallel to Act I The scene is laid in the house of Rākṣasa and the adjoining road A spy of Rākṣasa under the disguise of a snake-charmer is seen on the road, approaching the house of Rākṣasa Then in a soliloquy he tells us how he is struck by the political acumen of both Cāṇakya as well as Rākṣasa, and declares that he would now see Rākṣasa

Inside the house just at this stage, is seen Rākṣasa indulging in a soliloquy, bearing testimony to his sentimentality It may easily be observed that whereas Rākṣasa very often lapses into poetry Cāṇakya very rarely does so It is just in keeping with his character that Rākṣasa severely upbraids Lakṣmī[22] and avows that he would soon deprive her of her very resort (by killing Candragupta) [23] This naturally leads him to state what he has done to achieve his end, and from this statement we see how Rākṣasa also is not an ordinary politician One, however, wonders how he is deceived into taking Jīvasiddhi (a fast friend and spy of Cāṇakya) as his best friend and spy [24] The reference to fate[25] in the end of his soliloquy again helps us to contrast him with Cāṇakya who is ever full of self-confidence

Then comes in Kañcukin bringing a gift of ornaments to Rākṣasa from Malayaketu Rākṣasa, though unwilling to do so, puts them on at the request of the Kañcukin who thereon goes away satisfied This short scene shows how Rākṣasa is considerate and rather soft at heart It also shows Rākṣasa's deep devotion to his former masters—a quality which had evoked unstinted praise[26] from no less a person than Cāṇakya

Then follows a section corresponding to the conversation between the spy and the pupil after Cāṇakya's monologue in

Act I This section, like the corresponding section in Act I, serves to bring out the contrast between Cānakya on the one hand and Rāksasa on the other We see here Rāksasa committing some blunders Thus he first declares that he does not want to see the serpents' play, [27] but that he would listen to the kāvya from the snake-charmer since he appears to be a good Prakrit poet also [28] But when actually the spy is ushered into his presence, he asks his servants to go away saying that he would divert himself with snakes [29] Again Rāksasa's inferiority to Cānakya is apparent when we see him remarking that he has forgotten[30] that the snake-charmer was his own spy whom he had sent to gather information from Kusumapura, and also when in the presence of his servants he calls his spy by his real name [31] It is thus clear that Rāksasa, though a great politician, is yet inferior to his rival Cānakya, and more sentimental and soft-hearted than he Rāksasa's resourcefulness, however, is evident from the way in which he turns *vrādha* into *Virūdha-śmaśru*

Corresponding to the scene containing the spy's narration in Act I we have here a scene where the snake-charmer narrates several events showing how the several plans devised by Rākṣasa to kill Candragupta were frustrated and resulted in the destruction of several of his trusted friends and helpmates Like the narration in Act I here also we find the narration of Virādhagupta interrupted by several remarks of Rākṣasa, revealing several traits of his character Thus in the very beginning when the spy begins by telling how the city was besieged, Rāksasa is at once all fury and orders his men to march [32] This only shows the sentimentality of Rākṣasa On being reminded, however, that it was all a matter of the past, Rāksasa's sentimentality again breaks out into his remembrance of the special favour of the Nandas he had been enjoying [33] Rākṣasa is again struck to hear that the poison-maiden sent by him to kill Candragupta was utilised by

Cānakya to kill Parvateśvara and compares this incident with a similar incident in the Mahā-bhārata [34] As Virādhagupta proceeding tells how Dāruvarman had rather hastily erected the outer porch in anticipation of Cānakya's orders and how Cānakya merely remarked that he would soon receive a good reward befitting his diligence, Rākṣasa at once reads the situation and rightly remarks that the attempt of Dāruvarman must have miscarried or even resulted in something evil [35] This clearly shows that Rākṣasa was possessed of a keen insight and deep intelligence For Dāruvarman's plan, far from being successful, had actually resulted in his own death and also that of Vairocaka and Varvaraka When Virādhagupta further tells now Cānakya crowned Vairocaka along with Candragupta not only promising but also actually giving him half of the kingdom, Rākṣasa at once sees how before doing so Cānakya must have already planned to bring about his murder by some other means and how all this show was only meant to wipe off the ignominy arising out of the murder of Parvataka [36] On going through all this scene between Virādhagupta and Rākṣasa one can't help being struck at the far-reaching plots that Rākṣasa had hatched and how he had tried to capture the very abode of Candragupta This sad tale of the failure of all his plans ultimately evokes from Rākṣasa again his belief in fate[37] which only serves to show that he is inferior to Cānakya and also to win our sympathies for him This naturally leads to the second instalment of the unpalatable pieces of news viz the banishment of Jīvasiddhi with disgrace from Kusumapura, the impalement of Śakatadāsa, and the imprisonment of Candanadāsa The remarks of Rākṣasa in connection with each one of these clearly show his appreciative nature (even as regards his enemies),[38] his sense of devotion to his masters and their cause,[39] and his sincerity of friendship [40]

This chain of dismal tales is now happily interrupted to the

extreme relief of the spectator whose patience is upto now sufficiently tried, and there is some bright news for Rākṣasa about the safe arrival of Śakatadāsa with Siddhārthaka, his rescuer This, of course, rouses the curiosity of the spectator who is now reminded of the instructions that Cānakya had given to Siddhārthaka The spectator is, therefore, naturally interested in observing how Siddhārthaka proceeds Rākṣasa, on coming to know from his friend that Siddhārthaka was responsible for his rescue from the jaws of death, is highly pleased with him and bestows on him the ornaments that he had on his person at the moment These, it may be remembered, are the very ornaments which were sent by Malayaketu to Rākṣasa in the beginning of this Act These ornaments, innocently introduced as they are in this Act, are very cleverly utilized by Viśākhadatta later on This incident also is in accordance with the sentimentality which, as we have already seen above, is a trait of Rākṣasa's character The cleverness of Siddhārthaka is clear when we find him with a plausible excuse requesting Rākṣasa to allow him to deposit the ornaments with him under his own seal and again readily handing over the seal ring to Rākṣasa, who in his turn hands it over to Śakatadāsa for using it in all future transactions This seal is, of course, the same that is introduced in Act I In obedience to Cāṇakya's instructions,[41] Siddhārthaka also requests to be admitted into Rākṣasa's service since it was now impossible for him to go back to Kusumapura after what he has done

All this while Virādhagupta is kept idle on the stage which can be said to be a defect in Viśākhadatta's workmanship After the exit of Śakatadāsa with Siddhārthaka, Virādhagupta tells Rākṣasa of the widening gulf between Cānakya and Candragupta Being rather encouraged by this information Rākṣasa at once asks Virādhagupta to go back to Kusumapura and instruct his spy Stavakalaśa (serving Candragupta as his

bard) to excite Candragupta by suitable verses and inform him accordingly through Karabhaka

Soon after Virādhagupta leaves, a man comes with ornaments and a word from Śakatadāsa that the ornaments are for sale and that he should like to know whether he should buy them for him The dramatic importance of this incident would be clear when later on we shall see how these very ornaments (and these are the ornaments of Parvateśvara given away by Candragupta to Viśvāvasu and his brothers in Act I) are used to show Malayaketu that Rākṣasa has been secretly allying himself with Candragupta and plotting against his life[42]

This Act ends with Rākṣasa expressing his confidence that the two viz Cānakya and Candragupta will fall out with one another because they both have accomplished their purpose[43]

In Act II thus we see how the mudrā is made to pass from Siddhārthaka to Śakatadāsa through Rāksasa, how the ornaments are made to go from Malayaketu to Rākṣasa, and from him to Siddhārthaka, who deposits them with Rāksasa himself for the time being, and also how the ornaments of Parvateśvara are made to pass from Candragupta to Viśvāvasu and his brother in Act I and thence to Śakatadāsa for Rākṣasa This act also reveals the sentimental nature, political wisdom, tenderness of heart, staunchness of friendship, and such other qualities of Rākṣasa as also his blundering nature Act II presents an exact parallel to Act I in this that while Act I reveals the plots and plans and the salient features of the character of Cānakya, Act II does the same in the case of Rāksasa Even from the point of view of construction the parallelism between these two Acts is only too evident from the beginning to the end

ACT III

Garbhānka is not a very usual phenomenon in Sanskrit drama, and the earliest writer known to have used it so far

is Śrī-harsa[44] Act III of the Mudrā-rāksasa may be fittingly described as a precursor of this device The whole of the Act is nothing but a sort of drama in which Candragupta and Cānakya play the main roles The scene is laid in this Act for the most part in the Sugānga palace in Kusumapura and the road adjoining it The incident in the Act apparently is the logical sequence of the plan of Rāksasa, though, in fact, it is nothing but a strategy used by Cānakya to outwit Rāksasa

The Act begins with the appearance of the kañcukin on the stage and indulging in what is technically called *ākāśabhāsita*[45] This is the device used by Viśākhadatta to make the spectator acquainted with certain circumstances which he must know before he can follow the events in the Act Generally this purpose is served by what is known as the *interlude* (*praveśaka* or *Viskambhaka*) But Viśākhadatta has simplified matters by using only a sort of monologue instead From this monologue we know that king Candragupta wants to see the city celebrating the kaumudī-mahotsava in obedience to his orders, but finds that the citizens are not celebrating it since it is prohibited by somebody and that too without his knowledge

Here Candragupta is introduced to the spectator declaring how it is the lot of the king to be always ill at ease,[46] how this feeling of uneasiness waxes strong at the idea of Laksmī being insatiable indeed,[47] and lastly how for him in particular the worse has come to worst since his preceptor has asked him to pick up a sham quarrel with himself and conduct the affairs of the state by himself for some time—something which he looks upon as a grave sin[48] On a second thought, however, he feels that he has even before been independent in the administration, for he was always free to do the right, and was checked by his preceptor only when he was going wrong[49] This soliloquy of Candragupta serves a double purpose by giving us some of the salient features of the character of Candragupta viz his sentimentality, devotion to and implicit

faith in his preceptor, and also his sensibility and humility, and at the same time preparing us for the main topic of this Act by informing us that the ensuing quarrel between Cāṇakya and Candragupta is only sham and forms part of Cāṇakya's strategy

In the scene that follows, Viśākhadatta has clearly brought out the poetic spirit of Candragupta by making him describe the autumn in three fine verses[50] containing very fine poetic ideas But this has been used only as a prelude to what follows, for very soon Candragupta notices the absence of the kaumudī celebrations and comes to know from the kañcukin that the festival has been prohibited by Cāṇakya who is, therefore, sent for This naturally incites the interest of the spectator who is now curious to know how Cāṇakya would face the situation

Viśākhadatta at this stage thinks it fit to give the spectator some idea of the spirited nature of Cāṇakya (and the reason for the same), by shifting the scene to the house of Cāṇakya and making the kañcukin describe Cāṇakya's house[1] and pointing out in particular to his utter self-lessness The situation is thus charged with immense possibilities and the spectator only wonders how matters would exactly shape themselves

The scene again shifts to the Sugāṅga palace where after preliminary greetings and salutations the quarrel ensues as expected There is a hot exchange of questions and answers at the end of which ultimately Candragupta has to accept defeat[52] Candragupta thereon insults Cāṇakya by declaring that in his eye Rākṣasa is superior to the latter as is evident from the various valourous deeds that he has done till then[53] Cāṇakya taunts Candragupta by referring to his own vow which he has so admirably fulfilled,[54] but Candragupta attributes all that to fate[55] and again insults Cāṇakya by

adding that he was rather too boastful to be considered learned[56] The whole scene ultimately ends in Cānakya resigning his office and Candragupta ordering the kañcukin to proclaim the same to people

The whole of this scene is deeply political, bearing ample testimony to the political acumen, accuracy of judgment, right grasp of the situation, and the capacity to manage it, and after all a clear vision possessed by Cānakya He is ready with a reply to every question put to him by the king and every reply of his is so clearly logical that Candragupta could find no flaw in it The situation is very tense, indeed ! And had the spectator not been told beforehand that it was only a sham quarrel, his interest would certainly have flagged The subject-matter is very abstruse and is couched in a highly scientific terminology and phrasealogy Happily enough the short questions of Candragupta at various intervals and the sharp repartee between Cānakya and Candragupta go a long way to relieve the tension But for these the whole scene would have been extremely taxing and even undramatic Viśākhadatta has shown great skill in managing this scene so admirably The spectator would certainly agree with Candragupta when he declares at the end of this Act that he has an attack of headache[57] There is, however, one thing which gives him relief by rousing his interest viz, the remark[58] of Cānakya to the effect that this split, which apparently Rākṣasa has caused between himself and Candragupta, would ultimately be utilized in bringing Rākṣasa himself into trouble

The concluding remark[59] of Candragupta clearly shows how devoted he was to Cānakya and how he was smarting under a sense of shame on account of the insults that he had to offer to his preceptor These remarks only serve to remind the spectator that the quarrel that has just ended was only sham, though both Cānakya as well as Candragupta appeared to have been flared up in its course

The third Act may thus be said to give us the salient features of the character of Candragupta viz, his poetical spirit, his devotion to and faith in his preceptor, Cānakya, his sincerity and simplicity The Act also serves to explain the depth of the working of Cānakya's policy by making him reveal the logic behind several of the steps he has taken But the most important purpose served by this Act is that it completely deludes Rāksasa who, misled by this strategic quarrel of Cānakya with Candragupta, leads an expedition against Candragupta and in approaching Kusumapura is, in fact, approaching his own defeat

ACT IV

The real skill of a dramatist lies in arranging the various incidents of his plot one after another in such a way that they should be perfectly natural in the places where they are shown to occur He has also to see that nothing that is stated or represented on the stage is without any use of its own The greater the number of uses to which one thing or statement is put the greater the skill of the play-wright

In the very beginning of the Act IV when Karabhaka tells the door-keeper that he wants to see Rākṣasa, the latter tells him that Rākṣasa is suffering from head-ache and hence asks him not to speak very loudly [60] Viśākhadatta's skill can be noticed when we find that the head-ache mentioned here is also used by him as an excuse for Malayaketu to pay a visit to Rākṣasa[61] only to find him asking Karabhaka whether he has seen Stavakalaśa in Kusumapura This naturally tempts Malayaketu to wait outside and overhear the conversation,[62] naturally because his ears were all the while being poisoned by Bhāgurāyana and other spies of Cānakya against Rākṣasa A glimpse of this poisoning is given to the spectator by Viśakhadatta by introducing Malayaketu on the stage in this Act in

conversation with Bhāgurāyana and asking him to explain what Bhadrabhata and others must have meant when they stated that they wanted to serve him not through Rākṣasa but through Śikharasena, the commander-in-chief [63]

Viśākhadatta's stage-craft is also seen when he makes Rākṣasa remark that he has forgotten the exact mission on which Karabhaka was sent by him [64] This, it may be noticed, is not unusual in Rākṣasa, and hence does not appear to be unnatural But at the same time it saves Viśākhadatta a very awkward situation While Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana are holding the attention of the spectators, Rākṣasa and Karabhaka would have been required to remain idle on the stage and that would be a great flaw in the construction of the play Viśākhadatta very cleverly has made Rākṣasa forget the exact mission of Karabhaka and then try to remember the same Thus while Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana are having their conversation on one side of the stage, on the other side Rākṣasa is seen sitting and thinking, trying to remember what the mission of Karabhaka might be! And Karabhaka also is keeping silent, being rather puzzled by the silence of Rākṣasa, which he possibly takes as being due to his head-ache

Then follows a bifocal scene with Rākṣasa and Karabhaka inside the dwelling of Rākṣasa, and Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana just outside Karabhaka is giving information of the incidents in Kusumapura—particularly the split between Cānakya and Candragupta, and the effects thereof, and Rākṣasa is passing certain remarks at various intervals, thus showing what his future plans would be Just at this time Malayaketu also at various intervals passes certain remarks or puts questions to Bhāgurāyana concerning the remarks of Rākṣasa, and Bhāgurāyana on his part also so explains the remarks as to convince Malayaketu that Rākṣasa is seriously thinking of allying himself with Candragupta and treacherously leading him (i e Malayaketu) to his ruin This scene is

highly interesting, indeed, and serves to disclose to the spectator the working of Cānakya to some extent Bhāgurāyana, Bhadrabhata and others have absconded at the end of Act I, and there Cānakya has suggestively remarked that tney all may fare well on their way The curiosity roused there is now partially satisfied here in Act IV by this bifocal scene which also helps the plot to progress This scene is also important as giving us some idea of the character of Malayaketu who here figures as a suspicious king with little judgment of his own, easily led by others, putting confidence in wrong types of persons and showing distrust about his own faithful friends and allies like Rāksasa

There is, however, one defect in this magnificently managed scene Śakatadāsa has entered the stage along with Rāksasa almost at the beginning of the Act But from that time almost upto the end of this bifocal scene he has to remain idle The main purpose for bringing him on the stage appears to be that he is to be asked to take away Karabhaka and look to his comfort and thus make room for the entrance of Malayaketu [65] The awkwardness of the situation whereby Śakatadāsa is required to keep idle on the stage so long, is sought to be redressed by making Rākṣasa express his doubt about the plausibility of the rumour disclosed by Karabhaka[66] and making Śakatadāsa pass one remark in support of the same [67] But this attempt on the part of Viśākhadatta to save the situation is more artificial than natural, and Śakatadāsa's long silence on the stage has to be taken as a defect in the workmanship of Viśākhadatta [68]

During the bifocal scene the ears of Malayaketu are sufficiently poisoned against Rākṣasa, and in the scene that follows Malayaketu is seen putting several questions to Rāksasa only to get his prejudices confirmed The prejudiced mind of Malayaketu can very well be perceived from his svagata remark that he, fortunately, is not dependent on his minister [69] The

conversation between Rākṣasa and Malayaketu is also highly political and corresponds to a similar conversation between Cānakya and Candragupta in the preceding Act But whereas that conversation is more spirited, this one appears to be rather insipid Again in Act III though Candragupta is apparently quarrelling with Cānakya yet at heart he is a devoted pupil of his and the spectator is made aware of this by his remarks more than once In this scene, however, the case is just the reverse , for though Malayaketu is apparently friendly towards Rākṣasa, yet at heart he is thoroughly prejudiced against him Viśākhadatta has shown great skill in this arranging the scenes in different Acts and thus bringing out some of the salient features of the characters of some of his dramatis personae This scene ends with Rākṣasa assuring Malayaketu that their success was now sure[70] and that that was the opportunity for them to march against Candragupta, and Malayaketu leaving the stage with Bhāgurāyana declaring that he would immediately start the expedition [71]

As in the last scene, so also in this, Viśākhadatta has exposed himself to a defect by keeping Bhāgurāyana idle on the stage during the whole of the scene Queerly enough though Bhāgurāyana has accompanied Malayaketu, he has not one remark to make while the latter is holding conversation with Rākṣasa It is true that Viśākhadatta does not give any stage direction to show that Bhāgurāyana enters into the presence of Rākṣasa along with Malayaketu [72] But even then it would only mean that he was waiting outside for such a long time which also is not less blameworthy from the point of view of stage-craft

The last scene of this Act brings out the belief of Rākṣasa in the Jyotih-śāstra and affords a fine example of dramatic irony when we see how the astrologer, that Rākṣasa could find, is none else than Kṣapanaka—one of Cānakya's trusted spies

—who all the while is suggesting that Rāksasa should now join hands with Candragupta who is at the height of prosperity and that he would be benefitted only if he allies himself with him Apparently, however, he is giving Rākṣasa a muhūrta for starting his expedition and Rāksasa is raising an objection to the muhūrta suggested by him, and he again is justifying it Rāksasa at this stage little dreams that the astrologer before him is a trusted spy of his very adversary, Cānakya Sub-consciously, however, Rāksasa is now being dragged towards Candragupta by the force of circumstances, and we see his sub-conscious mind picking up only a corresponding aspect of the phenomenon of sunset as described by him in the concluding stanza of this Act[73] Would rāksasa have ever believed that he himself would very soon afford an illustration of the general remark he has made? But is it not only about a fortnight later that Rākṣasa was forced to accept the ministership of Candragupta who was instrumental along with Cānakya in bringing about the extermination of his former masters, Nandas, whose cause he has been so bravely and faithfully cherishing till then?

Act IV is perhaps the most interesting in the whole of the Mudrā-Rāksasa But for the two blemishes referred to above, all the scenes here have been so admirably arranged that they have a very tight grip on the mind of the spectator from the start to the finish The plot also is made to progress very rapidly now The first three Acts are taken up by the setting of the trap by Cānakya by various means which one and all have roused the interest and curiosity of the spectator, and from this Act begins the unravelling of the working of those means Thus now the spectator knows what mission Bhāgurāyana, Bhadrabhata and others were entrusted with as suggested by the remark of Cānakya in Act I[74] There are yet many other points[75] which require further elucidation which Viśākhadatta would give in the Acts that follow Like each

of the preceding Acts this Act also has brought to light some of the salient features of the character of one of the dramatis personae, Malayaketu, where in fact lies the root[76] of the defeat of Rākṣasa's plan But as yet the spectator does not know how exactly this trait in Malayaketu's character would be utilized by Cānakya for this purpose He, therefore, is very eager now to observe what follows It is from here that the plot is heading towards the denouement and it is from here again that the spectator naturally watches the play with wrapt attention and bated breath right upto the end

ACT V (INTERLUDE)

The Mudrā-rāksasa has two interludes[77]—both of them Praveśaka—at the beginning of the fifth and the sixth Acts An Interlude is a portion of a play making the reader acquainted with some events that have already occurred (or are very soon to occur) and the knowledge of which is absolutely necessary for a clear understanding of what is to follow Such interlude when wholly in Prakrit is called praveśaka, but when it is in Sanskrit and Prakrit it is called Viskambhaka The Mudrā-rākṣasa has no Viskambhaka

At the end of Act IV we see how the expedition has started The events in Act V have occurred some days after the expedition has started and when the armies of Malayaketu are camping in the vicinity of Kusumapura This naturally has led to some strictness as regards the entrance into and exit from the camp Nobody is allowed to come into and go out of the camp without having the pass-port from Bhāgurāyana [78] The spectator is made acquainted with these circumstances (which have developed since the end of Act IV) through the conversation between Ksapanaka and Siddhārthaka, who (the latter) appears on the stage with a letter and an ornament box, both of them bearing the seal of Rākṣasa as he himself reveals it The spectator's interest is roused when he learns

from Siddhārthaka that the letter is the one which Cāṇakya has got written by Śakaṭadāsa and sealed with Rākṣasa's ring in Act I, and that the box also is sealed with the same ring From Siddhārthaka's remark it is again clear that he has no pass-port from Bhāgurāyaṇa, and that he is sure that he would be able to go to Pāṭaliputra even without the passport on the ground that he is a trusted man of Rākṣasa The spectator may also remember that in Act I Cāṇakya has whispered some instructions into the ear of Siddhārthaka which he was asked to execute when the enemy approached the capital He is, therefore, greatly interested in knowing what the instruction might be and how thereby the main aim of Cāṇakya viz, the winning over of Rākṣasa is going to be achieved The interlude may, therefore, be said to be very important dramatically as supplying the spectator with some necessary information, and at the same time rousing his interest and helping the plot to progress

ACT V

This Act is perhaps the most important in the whole of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa, for it is here that the climax is reached and the plot begins to head towards a catastrophe, which, of course, has been very cleverly managed by Viśākhadatta At the end of Act IV Rākṣasa apparently is making for success and it would appear as if he would succeed in his project The spectator, however, knows full well how this only means Rākṣasa's delusion, for the very foundation of his plan viz the estrangement of Cāṇakya from Candragupta is some airy nothing It is only an irony of fate that Rākṣasa, who in fact was heading towards his own doom and defeat, should be thinking otherwise The result, therefore, is that the disillusionment, when it comes, is only too shocking for Rākṣasa, so much so that he simply breaks down to the point of committing suicide, but is prevented from doing so by the thought of

saving a faithful friend

The stage for the first section[79] of this Act is arranged in such a way that on one side of it is seated Bhāgurāyana for giving pass-port to those who ask for it, and on the other, Malayaketu who has gone there to see Bhāgurāyana but waits outside and listens to what the Ksapanaka is saying to Bhāgurāyana Bhāgurāyana in a remark tells us that he has to deceive Malayaketu at the instance of Cānakya, though he does not like to do so, [80] while Malayaketu gives expression to his suspicion about Rākṣasa[81] which, as we have already seen, has been created in his mind by Bhadrabhaṭa and other spies of Cāṇakya The scene is thus a bifocal one Kṣapanaka is brought to Bhāgurāyana asking for the mudrā, and there ensues a conversation between them On the other side there is Malayaketu who overhears their conversation and has his prejudice against Rāksasa deepened Viśākhadatta has shown his dramatic skill by making Malayaketu overhear the conversation between Ksapanaka and Bhāgurāyana (both of them spies of Cānakya) Bhāgurāyaṇa asks Ksapanaka certain questions in reply to which, apparently with great reluctance, the latter discloses how he had to suffer for being a friend of Rāksasa who had killed Parvateśvara with a visa-kanyā, and further adds that even at that moment Rākṣasa was contemplating a similar cruel act [82] After this revelation Bhāgurāyana apparently satisfied with the innocence of Ksapanaka gives him mudrā and requests him to tell the same over again to Malayaketu himself [83] But Malayaketu himself enters into their presence declaring that he has heard all the heart-rending tale Kṣapanaka thereon leaves the stage feeling happy at the idea that his work is done [84] This scene brings out effectively a defect in the character of Malayaketu which presents a good contrast to that of Bhāgurāyana For though the latter is deceiving the former, he feels sorry that he has to do so while

Malayaketu though apparently friendly to Rākṣasa and his other allies, is yet harbouring a feeling of distrust for them all!

Then follows a short scene where Bhāgurāyana tries to tone down Malayaketu by showing him how Rākṣasa is not to blame for the murder of Parvateśvara, for it was after all a political murder This short scene is highly important inasmuch as it shows how Malayaketu was easily impressed one way or the other We have already seen Malayaketu's lack of judgment in the last Act, where he is found being led by Bhāgurāyana in almost every thing Here this trait in his character is very vividly brought out, for though he is extremely enraged against Rākṣasa, yet on hearing Bhāgurāyana's argument he tones down his anger and agrees to put up with Rākṣasa until Candragupta is defeated and the promised kingdom is obtained This again brings out two more baser traits in Malayaketu's character viz infidelity and selfishness

The next scene begins when a man brings Siddhārthaka who is captured while trying to escape from the camp with a letter but without a mudrā Bhāgurāyana begins to cross examine him in the presence of Malayaketu who is also giving some directions to Bhāgurāyana at different intervals Thus Viśākhadatta has avoided the awkwardness of keeping any character idle on the stage for a long time Thus Malayaketu asks Bhāgurāyana to take the letter from Siddhārthaka and open it, keeping the seal intact [85] He then takes the letter and reads it himself A few moments later Siddhārthaka, being flogged, drops down from under his arm a casket of ornaments sealed with Rākṣasa's ring, and when that is brought in, Malayaketu at once remarks that it must be the accompanying present mentioned in the letter, and asks Bhāgurāyana to open it keeping the seal intact [86] Now matters grow worse, for the ornaments are those which Malayaketu had presented to Rākṣasa from his own person This convinces

Malayaketu that the letter was addressed to Candragupta [87] After a good flogging again Siddhārthaka reveals to Malayaketu that he was sent by Rākṣasa with the letter to Candragupta Naturally, therefore, Malayaketu now desires to hear the oral message, and Siddhārthaka gives it saying that the five mleccha kings have contracted friendship with Candragupta, that three of them desire to have his (i e Malayaketu's) territory and the remaining two, his elephants and treasury, and that Rākṣasa has requested Candragupta to please them in this respect just as he has pleased him by dismissing Cāṇakya The poisoning is now complete and Malayaketu now has a distrust not only for Rākṣasa but also for his five mleccha allies [88] He thus completely severs himself from them all only to fall an easy prey into the hands of Bhāgurāyana and others, his so-called friends and advisers This scene not only very well displays the folly of Malayaketu, but also shows how Siddhārthaka and Bhāgurāyaṇa are very clever and shrewd and do their work quite faithfully, even though in the heart of hearts they don't like it That Malayaketu is an utterly senseless monarch is shown here again by the fact that he puts more faith in the words of Bhāgurāyana and Siddhārthaka as against Rākṣasa and his other allies, so much so that he does not even think of giving them a fair chance to explain themselves if at all whatever was stated by Siddhārthaka was true In his vanity of being a politician, he has shown himself in worse lights In this he bears a good contrast to Candragupta who admittedly is far superior to him

Here Viśākhadatta has introduced Rākṣasa seated in his house, and worrying at the thought that his army has a vast number of Candragupta's men, and ultimately satisfying himself that they are one and all thoroughly dissatisfied with Candragupta [89] This clearly shows how man is always prone to construe facts in a light favourable to him Rākṣasa at this

stage naturally sends orders to the mleccha allies to march in different lines as previously settled, since Kusumapura was now near He, however, has no idea of what is going on in the mind of Malayaketu and how the latter is harbouring a grave distrust for him and also for the allied princes Rāksasa is too straight-forward a politician

Rākṣasa's considerate nature is again shown by the fact that as soon as the pratīhārī of Malayaketu tells him that Malayaketu desires to see him, he, out of consideration for the latter, asks his servant to bring an ornament and puts it on,[90] little dreaming that the same ornament was going to form a piece of evidence against him Ironically enough what Rākṣasa has done just to please Malayaketu out of good manners is only shortly to cause his displeasure and to be interpreted by him in exactly the contrary spirit Viśākhadatta by introducing such incidents in the play has very cleverly managed to rouse and sustain the interest of his spectators

The brief soliloquy[91] of Rāksasa at this stage is as suggestive as that at the end of the last Act, and affords a fine example of dramatic irony when Rāksasa makes a general statement that those on high are liable to fall The description of Malayaketu[92] at this stage by Rāksasa shows only his simplicity and unsuspecting nature which in fact has been fully exploited by his rival Cānakya all through, and is enough to make him the hero of a tragedy

Rākṣasa rightly observes that Malayaketu was deeply engrossed in thought, but has little idea of the storm gathering in his mind Malayaketu is now thoroughly prejudiced against Rākṣasa and his Mleccha allies and in the conversation that follows he construes every reply or remark of Rākṣasa in a wrong light Thus he construes the arrangement of the armies as given by Rāksasa as only confirming the story of Siddhārthaka about them[93] Similarly Rāksasa's remark that now there was no need of going or coming is also misconstrued

by Malayaketu who significantly remarks 'vijñāyate'[94] But in the scene that follows Rākṣasa is faced with several circumstances one after another which he finds very hard to explain away and which to all appearances go to prove that Rākṣasa was conspiring with Candragupta against Malayaketu Thus there is the evidence supplied by Siddhārthaka, Rāksāsa's own trusted servant, the letter, the ornament-box, the message to be delivered orally as stated in the letter, the seal, the hand of Śakatadāsa, and finally the ornament on his very person Rākṣasa tries to explain away these circumstances variously, but in vain Malayaketu is now so thoroughly convinced of the infidelity of Rāksasa, that Rāksasa sees no other alternative but to confess to the charge[95] and tell Malayaketu that he has become anārya[96] Malayaketu sees Rākṣas's unwillingness to admit his crime[97] and hence asks for an explanation about the letter and the ornament box, and when Rākṣasa says in reply that it was only the working of fate,[98] Malayaketu rebukes him for having killed his father and also for planning his own treacherous murder[99] Rākṣasa denies the charge and says that Fate alone is responsible for the incident, which enrages Malayaketu who now asks why Jīvasiddhi should not be referred to in this matter This is a revelation, shocking indeed, to Rākṣasa, for if he has captured the whole palace of Candragupta, his rival Cānakya has captured his very heart[100] The main purpose of Cānakya's plan is served Malayaketu is thoroughly misled and orders the kings, his mleccha allies, to be killed variously, but turning to Rākṣasa, with an air of nobility, he says that he is allowing him to go, for he is not viśrambhaghātī rāksasa[101] It is indeed an irony of fate that Malayaketu, who is in fact acting treacherously all the while with Rākṣasa, should himself accuse the upright minister, that Rākṣasa has been all along, of being treacherous Bhāgurāyana now suggests that the expedition should be resumed, and Malayaketu leaves the stage with his retinue

The concluding portion of this Act shows Rāksasa completely broken when he finds that all his plans have ultimately led to the destruction of his own people He is almost ready to commit suicide, but refrains from doing so only for the sake of his friend Candanadāsa [102]

This whole scene is very magnificently managed by Viśākhadatta and reminds us of the trial scene in the Mrcchakatika Just as there several circumstances one after the other go against Cārudatta and ultimately the ornaments like the last straw on camel's back, shatter all his hopes of proving his innocence, so also here several circumstances one after another go against Rāksasa and ultimately the ornament on his own person decides the matter against him Like Cārudatta, Rāksasa also feels constrained to accept the guilt with the effect that he calls himself anārya, though very unwillingly The letter, the ring, the ornament on his person—all these things quietly introduced in the first and the second Acts have now fully served their purpose and the spectators' curiosity is to that extent satisfied A final schism is brought about between Rākṣasa and Malayaketu and the Mleccha kings But still the interest of the spectator does not flag , for he yet is eager to know what Rāksasa would do further Viśākhadatta has managed in this way to rouse and sustain the interest of his spectators from the very beginning up to the end of this Act, and up to the end of the play also as we shall presently see

ACT VI (INTERLUDE)

This is the second and perhaps the more important praveśaka in the Mudrā-Rāksasa The end of Act V shows a complete schism between Malayaketu on the one hand and Rākśasa and the Mleccha kings on the other Malayaketu is at the height of folly and orders the five Mleccha kings, his erstwhile allies, to be put to death in different ways , but with an air of nobility he lets Rāksasa go wherever he likes and

boasts of his ability to fight them all together single-handed Again in Act V we have seen Siddhārthaka being captured on his way to Pātaliputra and producing things and making statements which go against Rāksasa But we are not told what has happened to him thereafter All this and several other important facts have been supplied by Visāakhadatta in this praveśaka

Thus from the conversation between Siddhārthaka and Samiddhārthaka we come to know that Siddhārthaka has just come from Malayaketu's camp to Pātaliputra and that as soon as he saw Cānakya, he was ordered by him to convey to Candragupta the happy news viz that Malayaketu, completely deluded by the policy of Cānakya, has killed his own allies, the five Mlecca kings, and is, on that account, deserted by his other allies for their own safety and is ultimately captured by Bhadrabhata and others, and also that the whole of the Mleccha army was attacked and overpowered by Cānakya with a vast army That Bhadrabhata and others had deserted Candragupta out of disaffection for him, and that Cānakya, as a result of a quarrel, had relinquished his duties as Candragupta's minister were only two screws in Cānakya's policy, unfathomed even by Rāksasa [103] This praveśaka also informs us that Rāksasa in the growing commotion has left Malayaketu's camp and has gone to Pātaliputra, and that Cānakya who has got from his spy, Udumbara, a report to that effect has ordered Siddhārthaka and Samiddhārthaka to lead Candanadāsa to the place of execution and execute him immediately

This praveśaka thus prepares the spectator for the main topic of Act VI viz how Rāksasa decides to surrender himself just to save his dear friend Candanadāsa from the gallows

ACT VI

The scene in Act VI is laid wholly in the jīrnodyāna of Kusumapura The appearance of the puruṣa (a spy of Cā-

nakya) on the stage and his statement, that he has been asked by Cānakya to see Rākṣasa at that place, rouses the interest of the spectator and he finds Rākṣasa appearing on the stage

Rākṣasa's soliloquy here is quite in keeping with his character as depicted upto now and also befitting the condition in which he finds himself at that time We have to note here, however, how in this sililoquy Visākhadatta has very cleverly shown the change that was slowly and gradually coming over Rāksasa Inspite of his repeated failures he still is not prepared to make peace with Candragupta [104] He would rather prefer to die But on a second thought he declares that he would rather give up his pratijñā than accept a defeat through his enemy's deceitful policy [105] Thus we see here how Rāksasa's mind is sub-consciously working and how only some pertinent circumstance was the only thing required to bring about the change in the mind of Rāksasa so eagerly desired for by Cānakya The source for such a circumstance is also suggested in this soliloquy when Rāksasa declares his intention to try to get some news about his friend, Candanadāsa [106]

The remaining portion of this Act forms a scene by itself in which Viśākhadatta has worked on the factor suggestively put forth in the above soliloquy This again takes advantage of Rākṣasa's sentimentality, softness of heart, and his devotion to a friend It is after taking into consideration these traits of Rāksasa's character that Cānakya has asked the man to hang himself just in front of Rāksasa, who on seeing him is sure to be moved by the sight and make enquiries about him This could very well be utilized to convey to Rāksasa the fact that Viṣnudāsa was burning himself to death just before his friend Candanadāsa was put to death by Cānakya's hangmen This tale of two persons attempting to give their life for avoiding to hear of their friend s ill-fated death has the additional effect of intensifying Rāksasa's feelings But the last stroke falls when Rākṣasa is told that Candanadāsa has

to face this calamity because he has refused to surrender the family of Rākṣasa by doing which he was given the option to save himself and his own Rākṣasa's heart is now thoroughly moved by this great sacrifice that Candanadāsa has made for his sake and the sacrifice which his friends were now about to make for him And the desired effect follows

True to his spirit, however, Rākṣasa proposes to set Candanadāsa free on the strength of his sword ,[107] but even that line of resistence has been closed for him by the shrewd Cāṇakya [108] Very cleverly thus has Viśākhadatta shown how Cāṇakya's policy worked out the whole situation and how ultimately Rākṣasa had no other course left open but to surrender himself which he now determines to follow [109]

Act VI thus brings us quite close to the denouement and the stage seems to be set for a tragedy, but for the canons of Sanskrit dramaturgy

ACT VII

This Act falls into two scenes The first scene is brought to an end by Rākṣasa surrendering himself and one of Cāndālas leaving the stage along with Candanadāsa , while the rest of the Act is covered up by the second The scene is mainly laid at the impaling station throughout this Act

The first scene reminds us of a similar scene in the tenth Act of the Mṛcchakaṭika, where Cārudatta is being led by the cāndālas to the place of execution Our author has, however, shown his dramatic sense by not imitating the scene very slavishly Instead of prolonging the scene tediously by leading Candanadāsa through several proclamation stands like Cārudatta, Viśākhadatta has cut it short by quickly bringing him to the impaling station and making him, on his way there, refer to only some relevant and important matters such as the sacredness of *mitra-kārya*,[110] the indiscriminate nature of the cruel or the wicked,[111] adversity being the touch stone of

friendship,[112] and the idea that gods help the bereft relatives of the dead[113] In a short space, Viśākhadatta has also brought out the salient features of the character of Candanadāsa's wife and son We see how her love for her husband finds fitting answers for each and every argument that Candanadāsa puts forth to dissuade her from her dreadful resolve The magnanimity of Candanadāsa's character also becomes evident when he tells his wife how it was an occasion for joy rather than sorrow He is not, however, without a human touch , and we see him requesting the cāndālas to allow him some time to embrace his son[114] And when he tells his son that he was meeting his end in the cause of a friend, the son also rises to the occasion and remarks that it was but their *kula-dharma*[115] The whole of this scene is a magnificent piece full of pathos and bringing out in only a few strokes the important traits in the characters of Candanadāsa, his wife, and son

The effect of this portion is heightened by Rāksasa entering the stage with a toss of curtain and requesting the cāndālas to set Candanadāsa free, and fasten the convict's garland on him[116] This is exactly what Cāṇakya has been aiming at from the very beginning At this stage in only two strokes has Viśākhadatta brought out the magnanimity of both Candanadāsa as well as Rākṣasa by making the former ask the latter what he has done by rendering all his efforts futile, and by making the latter reply that he was only partially imitating his good deed, and thereby seeking to accomplish his own selfish end[117] Rākṣasa's praise of Candanadāsa is only befitting his magnanimity and speaks highly of his appreciative nature[118]

In the beginning of the second scene we see Cāṇakya showing his face and asking the cāṇḍāla as to who has achieved the marvellous feat of catching Rākṣasa, and revealing the magnanimity of his heart by exhorting him to declare that it

was achieved not by Cānakya but by the adverse fate of the Nandas[119] This is enough to show Cānakya's goodness and humility, inspite of the boast in which he is shown to have indulged more than once in the course of the play Now follows the unravelling of the riddle part by part, and the curiosity of the spectator roused at various points previously is gradually satisfied Thus Cānakya is made to reveal to Rāksasa that one of the Candālas there was only a spy of his, Siddhārthaka by name, who has been in Rāksasa's service for some time, and that Śakatadāsa was made to write that fraudulent letter without his knowing that he was doing so[120] This helps to remove the blot on Śakatadāsa's friendship in the eye of Rākṣasa[121] Viśākhadatta makes Cānakya go even further and state all the details of his plan to catch Rāksasa and also the purpose behind it[122]

Rāksasa is now thoroughly made aware of what is expeced of him , and knows full well that he can't avoid it Candragupta is now brought on the stage, pouring unstinted praise[123] on Cānakya and his achievement and bowing down to him But Cānakya's greatness is revealed when he asks Candragupta to bow to Rākṣasa whom he calls amātya—nay *amātya-mukhya,* thus taking for granted that Rāksasa has accepted his proposal It is not, however, until Cānakya tells him in clear terms that Candanadāsa's life depends on Rāksasa's acceptance of Candragupta's ministership, that the latter agrees to do so[124] It is thus the love of a friend alone that persuades Rāksasa to become the minister of his former enemy

The height of the magnanimity of the two ministers is yet to be reached and the spectator also is as yet anxious to know what has happened to Malayaketu and Candanadāsa who have been referred to previously This is done in what follows and the desire of Cānakya being fully realised and his purpose served, the play comes to an end with the Bharata-vākya Thus is a probable tragedy averted and the dictum of Bharata obeyed

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERS IN THE MUDRĀ-RĀKṢASA

If we leave out of account the Mṛcchakaṭika, Viśākhadatta's Mudrā-Rākṣasa is perhaps, in the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature, the only play containing a large variety of characters, with this difference that whereas the characters in the former are from all walks and stations of life, those in the latter, most of them, belong to the political world Thus in our play we have kings, ministers, spies or secret emissaries under various disguises, and royal attendants There are some characters no doubt in it that are free from any political bias, but they are only too few and insignificant to mar the political atmosphere of the play The Mudrā-Rākṣasa is quite unique in this respect Let us now study the characters in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa and form an estimate of Viśākhadatta's skill in character-painting Before going into the details, however, it may be observed that Viśākhadatta, like Kālidāsa and other Sanskrit playwrights of note, has given us characters in twos or threes Thus we have two ministers, Cāṇakya and Rākṣasa, two kings, Candragupta and Malayaketu, two friends, Śakaṭa-dāsa and Candanadāsa, (to which may be added the name of Jīvasiddhi to make the number three), and a large number of spies or secret emissaries on either side It is by contrasting these with one another that Viśākhadatta has very often succeeded in making his characters more living as we shall presently see it

Let us now start with the ministers who form the most important class by themselves in this play It is the plots and counter-plots of the rival ministers that form the main bulk of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa But it may be intriguing to

observe that Viśākhadatta has shown great skill in portraying the ministers and bestowing individuality on either of them in various ways Cāṇakya is portrayed by Viśākhadatta as a minister and a politician par excellence, full of self-confidence verging on even boastfulness[1] which is almost shuddering, ever vigilant, quick of judgment, shrewd and inspiring awe, nay terror[2] He has keen intellect and sharp memory, and with a quick grasp of the situation, he has the capacity to turn almost every thing to his advantage with the least effort[3] Being a man of clear thinking, his acts are one and all always backed up by sound reasoning,[4] and this adds to the force of his arguments and remarks He is a good conversationalist and has succeeded in eliciting the required information from the mouth of Candanadāsa[5] He also displays the qualities of outspokenness and self-respect which are noticed even by the Kañcukin[6] Even Rākṣasa has high regard for his abilities as a minister and a politician[7] But there is one circumstance about him which inspires all about him with awe and terror rather than love He would use any means for accomplishing his object That is why we find almost everybody calling him deridingly *baṭu* or *baṭuka* and even *durātman*, and that is again why Candanadāsa so much hates him and has very bitter words to say about him[8] It must, however, be said to his credit that his aim is, at least so far as the Mudrā-Rākṣasa is concerned, not selfish, and Viśākhadatta has taken care to elevate him by depicting in a few strokes some aspects of his private life Thus he is shown to be utterly dis-interested, so much so that though commanding the highest respect from Candragupta as his preceptor and minister, he is living in an ordinary hut with almost no belonging of his own[9] However cruel and stern as a politician he is, he can yet appreciate the merits of even his enemies[10] He is, however, a firm master of his emotions to such an extent that he appears to be almost inhuman, a man without any emotions at all[11]

This, however, does not mean that he has absolutely no emotions The fact is that he has all his emotions perfectly under his control as can be easily seen from the circumstance that almost all his remarks showing emotions are *svagata* The general impression that we get of Cāṇakya on reading the Mudrā-Rākṣasa is that of a simple Brāhmaṇa, easily irascible by nature, a shrewd politician employing any means to achieve his aims, but disinterested and appreciative of real merit wherever it is found But for the relief afforded by his virtues like simplicity and appreciative nature, this mighty minister of Candragupta would have been perhaps highly detestable inspite of all his brilliance in politics, even as a cobra with a jewel on his hood

Cānakya bears a good contrast to Rāksasa who, even as Cānakya admits it, is endowed with prajñā, vikrama and bhakti all together [12] If Cānakya's aim is not selfish and hence perhaps noble, Rāksasa's aim is nobler still He is fighting the cause of his masters even after they have been exterminated by Cānakya [13] No doubt he tries to do away with his enemy Candragupta by any means whatsover But it must be admitted that he has not directed any of his questionable means against any other person, much less towards a friend and an ally In all his other deeds Rākṣasa gives us the impression of nobility and magnanimity hardly found in his rival His political acumen is seen when we hear an account of the various plans devised by him to do away with Candragupta and also when we see him inspite of the failure of all his previous plans at once making himself ready to take advantage of the reported split between Cānakya and Candragupta, and giving immediate instructions to his spy in that connection Rāksasa is more emotional and considerate He is touched to the quick[14] to see the sad plight of his spy Virādhagupta Being highly pleased with Siddhārthaka for rescuing his friend Śakatadāsa, he bestows on him ornaments on his own person Sudden

outbursts[15] on the caprices of fate in which he indulges at times also bear testimony to his emotional nature He puts on the ornaments[16] sent to him by Malayaketu only out of regard for the latter and also for the Kañcukin who had brought them Similarly he is careful enough to call for an ornament[17] and put it on when he has to go and see Malayaketu It is in this considerate and emotional nature of his that lies the root of Cānakya's success in entrapping Rāksasa Fidelity to a friend is yet another noble trait in Rāksasa's character and Cānakya has not been slow to exploit it to his advantage We see how he identifies himself with Śakaṭadāsa and also Candanadāsa He is highly grieved to think that Śakatadāsa[18] has proved faithless but never blames him severely on that account and is greatly relieved[19] to know that Śakaṭadāsa was after all not a faithless friend For Candanadāsa he has staked his very life and has ultimately given up his own long cherished desire to avenge the destruction of his former masters and accepted the ministership of his enemy As a politician he falls short of the height reached by Cānakya and commits blunders in various ways Being more distracted and worried he also finds his memory failing him at times We are impressed by his magnanimity and nobility right from the very beginning upto the very end[20] of the play with the result that in spite of his ultimate failure and in spite of his defects and drawbacks as a politician our sympathies are all for him than for his rival Cānakya Rākṣasa in fact is an emobodiment of some of the loftiest human virtues coupled with some minor characteristics which only make us feel that he is a man of our own flesh and blood

Next we come to the two princes Candragupta and Malayaketu The former is a devoted and well-disciplined pupil of Cānakya for whom he has so much regard that he is simply unwilling to go against any desire of the latter or to do any thing without consulting him In his soliloquy he clearly tells

us how he is much worried over the command of Cānakya to the effect that he should pick up a quarrel with him and conduct the state affairs independently for some time He is beside himself with shame for having disrespected his preceptor at his own command and wonders how others dare actually do it [21] We have also to notice the intelligence and artistic spirit displayed by Candragupta in his soliloquy describing the worries of a king,[22] the fickleness of Lakṣmī,[23] and the autumn season [24] He also shows his brilliance in the sham quarrel with his preceptor by putting him very appropriate questions Candragupta, so far as our play goes, has little independent existence of his own , but in whatever existence he has, he has shown himself to be a worthy disciple of Cānakya, the consummate politician, who also has described him as a king more interested in his subjects' welfare than in their money,[25] and as entirely dependent on him in the affairs of the state [26] No wonder that he expresses his full appreciation of this monarch by contrasting him with the Nandas more than once [27]

Quite a different type of king is represented by Malayaketu He is not only foolish and conceited, but even treacherous He has absolutely no judgment of his own and is very easily led away by whatever he is told by this or that person The worse of it is that he is very easily led to distrust even his best allies and thus bring ruin on himself with his own hands [28] He is brave and warlike and has a sense of pride which makes him abstain from performing the obsequies of his father until he avenges his death [29] His simplicity is evident from the fact that he himself goes out to see Rākṣasa when he is suffering from headache and also from the fact that he sends ornaments from his own person to Rāksasa with a pressing request that he should put them on [30] Only he is too rash and thoughtless and hasty in his actions and conclusions which makes him a bad soil for a politician like Rāksasa [31]

We may now turn to the two friends of Rākṣasa—Śakaṭadāsa and Candanadāsa The former is not only a friend but also an employee of Rākṣasa who has stationed him in Kusumapura with a large amount of money to help his secret workers[32] Cāṇakya has rightly accused him of aiding and instigating persons to plot against Candragupta's life and sentenced him to be impaled[33] But this Kāyastha has been very cleverly made to fit in Cāṇakya's plan A letter is got written by him without letting him know the names of the addressor and the addressee He is a very straight-forward person, and never dreams that his rescue by Siddhārthaka was only a part of a big plan of Cāṇakya He does not know till the end that Siddhārthaka was only a spy of Cāṇakya Again when the ornaments come for sale he does not care to know from whom he was buying them He was only a kāyastha, a scribe, and not a politician That explains all the part played by him in this play i e the part of unconsciously lending a helping hand not to his friend and master Rākṣasa, but to his rival and enemy, Cāṇakya His friendship, however, is unquestionable and even Rākṣasa is unwilling to admit that he would act treacherously[34] But instead of being of much help to his master and friend Rākṣasa, he only proves a source of trouble to him owing to his simplicity

A much dearer friend of Rākṣasa we find in Candanadāsa who from the very beginning is shown to have enjoyed his highest confidence For Rākṣasa had left his family with him only before he left Kusumapura for reasons of his own This confidence, as we see it in the play, is certainly not misplaced Like a true friend and a shrewd merchant, Candanadāsa before going to Cāṇakya has made arrangements for the removal of Rākṣasa's family to some safer place, and like a true friend again has he refused to surrender the same even at the risk of losing not only his wealth and family but even his life. Candanadāsa really evokes our admiration and certainly de-

serves any sacrifice on the part of Rākṣasa The real success of Cānakya's plan lies in this noble trait in the character of these two friends which Cānakya has rightly observed[35] and well utilised Rākṣasa also is fully aware of the worth of his friend and hence when he hears of the calamity to which he has exposed himself, he feels that the calamity has befallen not Candanadāsa but himself[36] The nobility of Candanadāsa is enhanced by Viśākhadatta in the last Act by putting several remarks in his mouth But still more important is the way in which he tries to console his wife and son, and also the fact that he is happy at the idea of having to die for the cause of a friend[37] His shrewdness is also seen in his conversation with Cānakya, who, however, proves more than a match for him

Of the secret emissaries and spies either mentioned or actually brought on the stage in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa, only three deserve special consideration, viz Siddhārthaka, Bhāgurāyana, and Jīvasiddhi all of whom have acquitted themselves quite excellently in the responsibility thrown on them by Cānakya Unfortunately Rākṣasa could not get capable spies and fate also may be said to be adverse to him But Cānakya had, it would appear, a trained eye for men, so much so that none of his spies may be said to be a failure The failure of Rākṣasa's plain is partly due to some weakness of his spies such as extravagance or unwise haste displayed by Pramodaka and Dāruvarman respectively, partly to the extreme vigilance and shrewdness of Cānakya as can be seen from the way in which he quietly made Vairocaka, covered all over in garlands, enter the palace seated on the female elephant of Candragupta and also followed by the latter's feudatories, and also partly to accident such as the appearance of ants with particles of food in their mouth which again was very shrewdly interpreted by Cānakya On the whole, however, the spies on either side appear to be quite well up in their business and would readily

answer the description of their class given by Cānakya in Act I[38] Nipunaka and Virādhagupta, as can be seen from the account they have given of their mission, have done their work quite excellently But Viśākhadatta has not cared to develop their characters any further The same may be said about almost all other spies except the three referred to above, which now we shall consider one by one

Siddhārthaka forms a very important screw in the plan of Cānakya From the time that he is directed to get the letter written by Śakatadāsa in Act I till the end of the play we see him playing an important part It is true that he is doing every thing according to the instructions of his master, Cānakya, but we must give him due credit for the ability he has displayed in executing the orders so well After receiving the present from Rākṣasa he has shown his intelligence by putting forth a plausible excuse[39] to be allowed to deposit the same with Rākṣasa only and also for being admitted into his service Cleverly again has he brought the ring to Śakatadāsa's notice and readily given it to Rākṣasa to win his full confidence The part played by him in Act V is simply marvellous and the various replies that he has given to Malayaketu and also to Rākṣasa are a sure sign of his fertile brain and resourcefulness He has a mixed feeling for Cāṇakya and his policy On the one hand we see him eulogizing the nīti of Cānakya,[40] but on the other we also see how he is in dread for him,[41] so much so that he is prepared to do even the worst of jobs in obedience to Cānakya's orders just to avoid his wrath. In Siddhārthaka thus we get a fine portrait of an intelligent and diligent servant, faithfully executing the orders of his master without questioning the goodness or otherwise of the job entrusted to him

Bhāgurāyana is another important screw in the plan of Cāṇakya, perhaps even more important than Siddhārthaka Though we are not told whether he had received any instruc-

tions from Cānakya, we can guess that he too must have received some general instructions from his master At the end of Act I it is revealed to us that Bhāgurāyana (and also Bhadrabhata and others) have absconded , and from Cānakya's remark there we know that he must have gone away on some mission of Cānakya himself It is not, however, until Act IV that we get a glimpse of Bhāgurāyana's character or of his mission There we see that he has won the confidence of Malayaketu in full so much so that he has now become his counsellor and referee almost at every step This must have been the natural result of the fact that it was Bhāgurāyana, to all appearance, that had helped Malayaketu to save himself from the clutches of Cānakya by running away from Kusumapura [1]- Once the confidence of Malayaketu is won, Bhāgurāyana goes on poisoning his ears against Rāksasa and his other Mleccha allies There must, indeed have been several occasions when Bhāgurāyana did this Viśākhadatta has, however, given us only a choice few Thus we see Bhāgurāyana cleverly interpreting[43] the request of Bhadrabhata and others to Malayaketu, and again equally cleverly conducting his talk with Kṣapanaka[44] and crossing Siddhārthaka when brought a captive before him for trying to run away from the camp without a pass-port [45] But the real spark of his intelligence is seen when he avoids, with a very plausible excuse, referring the letter directly to Śakatadāsa[46] which would have certainly frustrated the whole plan, and also when he, by a plausible argumentation, convinces Malayaketu of the advisability of pulling on with Rāksasa for some time at least [47] He would not miss even the slightest opportunity of poisoning Malayaketu's mind against Rākṣasa as can be seen from his remark when Rāksasa declares that he had bestowed the ornaments on Siddhārthaka for having rescued his friend Śakaṭadāsa [48] Bhāgurāyana is, indeed, a compeer of Siddhārthaka in almost every respect, though perhaps superior to him in

intelligence and with his conscience still alive That is why we find him expressing regret at the idea of having to deceive a trustful person like Malayaketu [49]

Jīvasiddhi's qualifications have been described by Cāṇakya himself in the first Act [50] He is thus only a Brāhmana friend of Cāṇakya well-versed in politics and the catuṣṣaṣṭyanga jyotiḥśāstra, acting under the guise of a Ksapaṇaka as a spy of Cāṇakya even before the extermination of the Nandas He also has carried out his responsibilities so well that even a politician like Rākṣasa is misled to look upon him as his friend Though he is referred to in Act I by Cāṇakya and in Act II by Rāksasa, we do not see him actually on the stage until the end of the fourth Act where he has displayed his skill in the use of language and also his proficiency in the jyotiḥ-śāstra [51] We see him all the while speaking in words with double entendre and besides supplying Rākṣasa with the muhūrta as required by him and trying to convince him of the advisability of catching that very muhūrta, he is also suggseting to him that he should stand to gain by allying himself with Candragupta and also conveying to him a warning that his alliance with a foreigner like Malayaketu by setting aside Candragupta, after all his own man, would surely lead to his destruction [52] The more important purpose served by him, however, is that of poisoning the ears of Malayaketu against Rākṣasa by declaring to Bhāgurāyaṇa within Malayaketu's hearing that Parvateśvara was killed by Rākṣasa only and not by Cāṇakya That this was meant to be heard by Malayaketu is clear from his own remark while leaving the stage in Act V [53] Thus we see that Jīvasiddhi also, in the limited scope that he has in this play, has shown a remarkable skill But we do not hear from this Jīvasiddhi any remark expressive of a sense of wonder at or admiration for or even dissatisfaction at Cāṇakya's policy as we hear it from the mouths of the other spies[54] of Cāṇakya that we have studied above This is

but quite natural in the case of Jīvasiddhi who is not a servant but a fellow student of Cāṇakya

Among the minor characters we have two kañcukins, two pratīhārīs, and persons like Karabhaka and Samiddhārthaka who have been portrayed only in a few bold strokes Among these only two deserve a special mention—the wife and the son of Candanadāsa Even these, like all other minor characters, are portrayed in a few bold strokes only Thus Candanadāsa's wife is shown to rise to the occasion and we see how she finds a suitable argument in reply to each of the arguments put forth by her husband [55] Her love for her husband has made her not only bold but also sharp-witted Like an ideal Aryan lady of Ancient India she wants to immolate herself before she is compelled to listen to an evil report about her husband, not earing for any thing, not even for her child Even the son in one sentence shows himself worthy of a father like Candanadāsa when he tells his father that it was but their kula-vrata to die in the cause of a friend [56] What a high ideal, indeed, for a young lad to realise ! The woman in Candanadāsa's wife and the child in his son clearly come out when they are full of grief and cry out for help or when the latter asks what he would do after his father's death It is, indeed, by touches like these that Viśākhadatta has succeeded in imparting life and individuality to these characters

Before bringing this chapter to a close we must consider another important question in connection with the characters in the Mudrā-Rākṣasa viz who is the hero of the Mudrā-Rākṣasa ? And the question becomes perplexing, indeed, when it is found that critics are divided in their views on this point, some putting forth the claims of Cāṇakya to the position and others being equally vehement in bestowing the honour on Rākṣasa It is not, therefore, quite easy to decide the question either way particularly as there appear to be cogent arguments in support of the claims of both We shall, therefore,

try to tackle the problem by asking the question 'Who is a hero?' and considering the claims of either in the light of the answer that we get to this question

The hero as the very name suggests it, is one who is mainly responsible for the development of the plot While defining an act[57] it has been suggested by oriental authorities on dramaturgy that the hero should be present on the stage in each and every act Several qualities[58] also have been ennumerated as the qualities of a hero in general, though all of them may not necessarily be found to exist in any single hero of any Sanskrit play known to us Four different types of heroes[59] have further been described under the appellations of dhīroddhata, dhīralalita, dhīroddātta and dhīrapraśānta, in general it has been stated that they are gods, kings, generals or ministers, and lastly Brāhmaṇas or merchants respectively Besides the hero some plays may also have a pratināyaka (rival hero) or a upanāyaka (a sub-hero, if we may so call him) Inspite of all this information, however, it is not always quite easy to fix up the hero of a Sanskrit drama as can very well be realised from the controversies raging on this point in connection with plays like the Veṇī-saṃhāra and the Mudrā-Rāksasa Restricting ourselves to the latter we may note that neither Cānakya nor Rākṣasa is actually present on the stage in each and every act, though in a way each of them may be said to carry the plot further almost at every step For it is the plots and the counter-plots of these two rivals that form the main bulk of its theme Both again can be said to be possessed of several of the qualities expected in a hero, and may be classed under one or the other of the four types mentioned above Thus it may be seen that if some conditions are satisfied by both, there are others which are satisfied by neither And particularly when it is observed that both these rivals by their plots and counter-plots arrest our attention throughout the play, it becomes extremely difficult, if not al-

together impossible, to decide the question in favour of any one of them

According to western critics[60] it is generally a tragedy that has some one or two figures towering aboving the rest The other characters there are so painted that they stand on a level far below the principal ones Tragedy, again, is often called after the name of the chief figure, who gives significance and tone to it The idea of a tragedy is foreign to Sanskrit literature, and yet it may be observed that what has been said above regarding English tragedy can very well apply to several of our Sanskrit plays such as the Śākuntala, the Uttararāmacarita and the Mudrā-Rākṣasa But for the canon of Bharata these, with little alterations in their present corpus, would have ranked among the finest tragedies in the world The tragic element in these is only too imposing to be lost sight of

Coming to the problem of the hero we find tragic hero defined as 'a person neither eminently virtuous or just, nor yet involved in crime by deliberate vice or villainy, but by some reason of human frailty' The tragic hero has the root of his fall not so much in external circumstances as in his own character It must be remembered that it is not the ultimate success or otherwise that prove or disprove the claim of a dramatis persona to the position of a hero It is rather a towering personality endowed with lofty qualities that makes a hero, and when certain apparently innocent traits in the character of such a person lead him to his ruin, our sympathies are naturally roused in his favour and we automatically acknowledge him as the hero, of course, a tragic hero Turning now to Rākṣasa we find that he is clearly possessed of a towering personality made all the more imposing by the possession of magnanimity of heart, staunch fidelity to his masters even after their complete destruction, a sound brain and great

valour Besides these again he is endowed with a softness of heart, considerateness for others, and sentimentality which lie at the root of almost every blunder that he has committed in the play leading ultimately to his defeat It may be easily seen that it is on him that our attention is focussed from the very beginning of the play right upto its end From the moment Cānakya declares[61] his unqualified admiration for Rākṣasa and also his intention—nay eagerness—to harness him into the services of Candragupta, we are interested more in Rākṣasa and his actions (or rather re-actions to the working of Cānakya) than anything else Even when our curiosity is roused by Cānakya's plots, a deeper thought will perhaps reveal that the curiosity at its base is not for Cānakya so much as for Rākṣasa We want, for example, to know how the plan of Cānakya will affect Rākṣasa and what will be his re-action thereto Both Cānakya as well as Rākṣasa are equally active hatching plots after plots for defeating one another, and we are surely interested in their working But the main point of interest is not so much the plot as the person who carries our sympathies And there can hardly be two opinions that our sympathies all through and ever increasingly are for Rākṣasa

Nor is Viśākhadatta slow to show his own inclination in this connection He has bestowed much care, it would appear, on Rākṣasa whose character has on that account been more dynamic The character of Cānakya is almost the same throughout the play as what we see of him in Act I Again there are hardly any ups and downs confronting Cāṇakya so far as the MR is concerned Rākṣasa, on the other hand, is made to undergo several ups and downs, and we see him moving on so to say It is these vicissitudes which Rākṣasa has to face that arrest all our interest, and in the play more than once we find ourselves watching Rākṣasa and his actions with bated breath At the end of almost every act we see Rākṣasa prominently intriguing us, a fact which can be said

to show that Viśākhadatta desired to emphasize Rākṣasa rather than his rival Cāṇakya

Inferior to Cāṇakya as a politician though, Rākṣasa has yet traits even nobler than his opponent Thus we see that Rākṣasa is inspired by a sense of duty and devotion to his masters even after their annihilation—a fact which is far more sublime than the boastful fulfilment of his vow by Cāṇakya which surly smacks of cruelty and selfishness by the side of the selfless devotion of Rākṣasa Viśākhadatta, no doubt, tries to bring this trait into relief by making the chamberlain in Act III describe his disinterestedness and selflessness But even then Cāṇakya hardly appears to equal—much less to tower over, Rākṣasa in point of selflessness Cāṇakya again falls too short of Rākṣasa in point of friendship He is unscrupulous enough to get the innocent[62] Sarvārthasiddhi murdered even though he had quietly retired to a penance-grove Some justification for this may perhaps be found in the fact that Sarvārthasiddhi was a scion of the Nanda family and hence an enemy But the murder of Parvateśvara through a poison maiden and that of Vairocaka by the falling arch can find no justification whatso ever, for as we know they were allies and therefore friends of Candragupta and hence of Cāṇakya The mischief intended by Rākṣasa could have been averted by punishing the poison-maiden and the carpenter and other culprits without endangering the lives of the allies These murders can at best be justified as political murders, but they certainly make their perpetrator appear in bad light before Rākṣasa who has acted with all the magnanimity of a hero under similar circumstances We see how Rākṣasa is greatly pained to learn that the forged letter was actually written by his dear friend Śakaṭadāsa, but is not prepared to believe it, how ultimately he is greatly relieved when it is revealed to him, that Śakaṭadāsa wrote the letter only without knowing what he was doing Rākṣasa is very unwilling to entertain any suspicion regarding

a friend even though he has every reason to do so Nobler still is the attitude shown by him to Malayaketu his erstwhile friend and ally now turned into an enemy He was brought a captive before Cānakya who referred the matter to Rāksasa And he like a noble hero declared that Malayaketu's life should be saved in view of their past friendship[63] Can we ever imagine Cānakya rising to this height ? Not that Cānakya is totally lacking the qualities of a hero He, in fact, is second to none , and is clearly responsible to a great extent for the progress of the plot We also have admiration for his political brain But Rāksasa in addition to the political brain (acknowledged even by his rival[64]) has certain other accomplishments which raise him far above Cānakya and easily mark him as the hero of the play

That Viśākhadatta intended Rākṣasa to be the hero of his play is shown by other considerations also It is a general rule that a play is named after the chief person i e the hero or the heroine or both, as can be seen from names like Cārudatta, Abhijñāna-Śākuntala, and Mālati-Mādhava In the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature we can hardly find an instance where a play is named after a character who is not its hero Again the Bharata-vākya is generally put into the mouth of the hero only, rather than any other character In the MR we find both these considerations to be in favour of Rākṣasa only, who may, therefore, be declared to be the hero of the play even in the opinion of Viśāakhadatta

We may now conclude this chapter by noting a peculiarity of the MR so far as characterization is concerned Viśākhadatta has introduced the main characters in the first four Acts one after the other Thus Act I brings before us Cānakya, while his rival Rākṣasa is introduced on the stage in Act II Similarly Candragupta appears on the stage for the first time in Act III and it is not till Act IV that we see Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana on the stage The author thus seems to have paid

greater attention to his characters and their introduction on the stage, and all through the play our interest is focussed more on character than on action It must be said to the credit of Visākhadatta that inspite of the abstruseness of his theme and absence of the sentiments of love and laughter, he has by his skill in character-painting endowed the play with an intrinsic interest all its own, though in doing this, as he himself has stated it, he must have been required to take infinite pains even like Rākṣasa, the minister of his own creation

CHAPTER V

SOURCES

Our study and appreciation of Viśākhadatta's abilities as a dramatist or a poet is bound to remain incomplete unless we take into consideration the debt which owes to his predecessors To be able to know accurately what Viśākhadatta has achieved in his work we must know what he has borrowed from others A knowledge of the exact form and nature of the matter or material borrowed by him will enable us to understand the real merit or otherwise of Viśākhadatta

Here at the very outset we must remember that the indebtedness of a poet or a play-wright might pertain to the main theme or story with or without some details, or to the use of various things or articles in the story, or to the arrangement of the different scenes, or to various other ideas and technical expressions incorporated in the work It is but well-known that the two great epics, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata, together with the Bṛhatkathā and the Purānas form the inexhaustible store-house from which most of the Sanskrit authors have drawn their themes It is only rarely that the theme is purely a creation of the poet's imagination[1] It is for the critic to find out the source or the sources of the play wright and compare the theme in the original with what has been given by the latter and see the effects of the changes introduced by him in the original As for the use of various things or the arrangement of the different scenes and so on, the critic has to cast a glance through the earlier literature and see if it presents any parallels—striking and close ones—to what is found in the work before him In such cases again it is the business of the critic to compare the matter before

him with the parallel available and see how far the author has imitated the earlier parallel and how far he has been able to leave his own stamp thereon It is considerations like these that ultimately enable a critic to judge of the place of an artist and his work among others and thus help him to form his own opinion about the same

Coming to the Mudrā-Rākṣasa it is evident that its author has derived his plot from some earlier sources For, the story of the overthrow of the Nandas and the installation of Candragupta Maurya in their place is a historical fact recorded not only in Greek chronicles but also found in several of the Purāṇas,[2] and also incorporated in the Bṛhatkathā as can be concluded from its presence in the Kathāsaritsāgara and Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī[3] A reference to this incident is also found in the Arthaśāstra[4] of Kauṭilya and the Nītisāra of Kāmandaka[5]

According to the Purāṇas,[6] Mahānandin, the last of the Śiśunāgas, married a śūdra woman and thus became the founder of a fresh dynasty His son, Mahāpadma (who is also called Dhanananda) and his eight sons are together known as the nava nandāh who were uprooted by Cāṇakya alias Kauṭilya (also called Viṣṇugupta) who placed Candragupta Maurya on the throne Greek chronicles,[7] however, attribute the low origin of the Nandas not to the low caste of their mother, but to a low caste father, 'a handsome barber, a paramour of the queen of the Nanda who murdered her husband, the king' Viśākhadatta differs from both these in mentioning the Nandas as mighty kings of illustrious lineage,[8] though he has skilfully utilised the traditional account about the Nandas, particularly their avarice and hoarded wealth A reference in the MR I 12 to the cause of Cāṇakya's rage shows that Viśākhadatta knew the story as narrated in the Bṛhatkathā

The Purānas make Candragupta the son of Murā, a low caste woman. There are several legends about Candragupta in Greek as well as Buddhistic and Jain chronicles.[9] According to the latter he is called Maurya because he belonged to the clan known as Moriya, a branch of the illustrious Śākyas. A posthumous son, he was seen by Cānakya 'holding a mock court on the village common as the rajah of the village boys'. Cānakya, incensed at the insult heaped on him by Dhanananda, took hold of this boy and after extermination of the Nandas placed him on their throne. Viśākhadatta is silent on the exact significance or derivation of the name Maurya as applied to Candragupta,[10] though he has shown him as an upstart of obscure or low birth.[11] He has also made Cānakya call him Vrsala[12] all through the play.

Greek chroniclers are silent about Cānakya who, therefore, according to some is a mythological figure. But the overwhelming evidence of Indian literature proves his historicity beyond all doubt. The story of his having exterminated the Nandas and placed Candragupta Maurya on the throne in their place is narrated not only in the Purānas but also in Kautilya's Arthaśāstra and Kāmandaka's Nītisāra. Viśākhadatta has made use of the Brhatkathā story and also the traditional information about Cānakya viz. his wrathful nature, his insult by the ruling Nanda prince, his vow to overthrow the Nandas by any means, and to wear his śikhā loose until the vow is fulfilled.

We thus see that Viśākhadatta has derived only the barest skeleton of his theme from the sources before him. Besides the prologue, he has also spun out of his imagination several details of great dramatic significance such as the sham quarrel between Cānakya and Candragupta, the poisoning of Malayaketu's ears against Rāksasa and the other allies and the consequent schism between them, the whole story of Candanadāsa and also the plans and the counter-plans of Cānakya and

Rākṣasa All these details have been so well woven into one fine texture that one really wonders at the art displayed here by Viśākhadatta The same is true of characters also in the MR For beside the few characteristics of two principal characters viz Cānakya and Candragupta, and a few characteristics of the Nandas, Viśākhadatta has borrowed nothing so far as the characters in the MR are concerned Thus the faithful and magnanimous Rākṣasa, the self-sacrificing Candanadāsa and his wife, the shrewd and loyal Siddhārthaka and Bhāgurāyana, and even the rash and vain Malayaketu are the creation of Viśakhadatta himself who, therefore, deserves credit for his achievement in this respect also

Viśākhadatta's indebtedness to Kautilya's Arthaśāstra is only too obvious Almost at every step we come across some technical terms or ideas which have been borrowed by our author from that famous work on politics Ṣādgunya, mandala, upāya, vyāyāma, prakrti, surangā, jigīsu, vyasana, ātmaguna, tīksna, rasada, tantrayukti, antahkopa, and bāhyakopa are only a few of them The terms parikleśa, upāya, tīksna, rasada, and vyāyāma have been used by Viśākhadatta in the sense ascribed to them by Kautilya in his Arthaśāstra Flogging as a means of extorting confessions and eliciting required information from the accused, adopted in the fifth act of the MR, has been actually recommended by Kautilya at Arthaśāstra IV 8 Similarly the idea that persons having the mudrā alone were to be allowed to enter or leave the camp, made use of in MR Act V again, has been clearly stated at Arthaśāstra II 34 The construction of a yantra-torana also seems to be hinted at in Arthaśāstra I 20 The untouchability of the cāndālas is again suggested by a simile at Arthaśāstra I 14 Kautilya also has laid down that a widow may remarry,[13] preferrably within the family of her deceased husband, and Viśākhadatta has referred to this idea by making Rākṣasa blame Laksmī by describing her as an ill-bred woman gone

to another family[14] Similar is the case with the idea of releasing all prisoners as ordered by Cānakya at the close of the play[15] From these and similar other instances it may easily be seen that Viśākhadatta was a close student of Kautilya's Arthaśāstra which he must have had before him while composing the Mudrā-Rāksasa

The signet-ring, the letter and the ornaments are the things invested with great dramatic significance in the MR , and it may be interesting to see some parallels to these in other earlier works Thus we know that the ring has been used in the Rāmāyana for the purpose of pratyabhijñā when Māruti convinces Sītā of his being a messenger of Rāma by showing her the latter's ring Kālidāsa has used the ring in two of his plays In the Mālavikāgnimitra it has been used to effect the release of Mālavikā, while in the Śākuntala it can be said to form the pivot on which the whole story turns For it is the ring that brings about the union and it is its absence again that brings about the separation of two loving souls Viśākhadatta has used the mudrā in a still different way For it does not lead to the release of any-body, nor does it bring about the union of two loving souls, nor again does its loss result in their separation Rāksasa's signet ring has been utilised in the MR for sealing the forged letter and the ornament box, both of which are later on produced as being sent by Rākṣasa to Candragupta Thus in the MR the sight of the Mudrā proves the identity leading to a catastrophe only to be averted by the vanity of Malayaketu

The letter has again been used by Kālidāsa in the Mālavikāgnimitra and also in the Śākuntala The one in the latter is only a love letter It is ony in the former that we have a letter of a political nature , but the letter in the MR differs from this also in being a forged document to be used against the enemy himself, and thus to bring about a complete schism

between Malayaketu on the one hand and Rākṣasa and the other Mleccha allies on the other

The use of the ornaments in the MR easily reminds us of the ornaments in the Mṛcchakaṭika Whereas in the latter we have one set of ornaments and a ratnāvalī, in the former we have two sets of ornaments—one of Parvateśvara and the other of Malayaketu , and just as the ornaments in the latter, dropped down from under the arm-pit of Maitreya, decided the case against Cārudatta, similarly the ornaments dropped by Siddhārthaka in the fifth Act of the former convince Malayaketu of Rākṣasa's infidelity Viśākhadatta's ingenuity, however, is realised when we see how he makes Rākṣasa (quite in keeping with his character) put on the ornament of Parvateśvara (of course, without knowing that it was so) and thus utilize that ornament as the last straw to crush all hopes of Rākṣasa by causing an irreparable rift between him and Malayaketu The Mṛcchakaṭika, indeed, presents several parallels to the MR , of which the scene when Rākṣasa is ultimately discomfited by the overwhelming evidence gathering against him even like Cārudatta and the scene at the impaling station in the last Act are the most striking

It may thus be seen that Viśākhadatta got only the skeleton of his main theme from earlier works , and that he has shown great skill in creating out of it a magnificent work of art, that the Mudrā-Rākṣasa admittedly is, not only by his deep study of Sanskrit poetics, metrics, and dramaturgy, but also by his intelligent study of earlier plays like those of Kālidāsa and Śūdraka without, however, being their slavish imitator [16]

CHAPTER VI

VIŚĀKHADATTA AS A DRAMATIST

The Mudrā-Rākṣasa has neither a Vidūṣaka the usual source of humour and laughter, nor a heroine In fact there is only one female character in it—the pathetic wife of Candanadāsa The usual attraction of a drama viz the sentiment of love also is conspicuous by its absence in this play And yet it is striking to note that out of the dry bones of a historical incident, which he received from sources available to him Viśākhadatta has created a play which has a firm grip on the spectator from the beginning to the end It may be interesting to see the ways and means devised by Viśākhadatta to achieve this purpose

And the first thing that we must note in this connection is the prologue The importance of a good beginning and a good end in a work of art, and more particularly in a dramatic composition, can hardly be exaggerated The first problem with a playwright is to attract the attention of his spectators and rouse their interest This he has to do with his prologue which on that account has to be short, lucid, and to the point It must also contain some matter which will attract the attention of the spectators Nor is the end any way less important The play must end before the spectator's interest begins to flag He must be still in the world that he has been visualizing so far, when he leaves the theatre Even a slight prolongation of the play beyond the proper moment will mar the impression made by the whole show Viśākhadatta has not only begun his play well but has also taken care to bring it to a close at the proper moment As we have already noticed the prologue of the MR is just what a prologue should be and has served

its purpose well by imperceptibly leading the spectator into the very heart of the main plot Nor is the end less artistic, for it comes as soon as all points of curiosity arising in the course of the play are explained

But it is long way from the prologue to the bharatavākya, and the play-wright has very often to tax his ingenuity to keep up the interest of his spectators roused by the former continuously up to the latter And the simplest means of doing this is variation in its different aspects Monotony tends to bring on dulness, and has to be killed by variation Alternation of Sanskrit by different Prakrits and that of prose by verse are too common to be discussed Nor is the alternation of the usual medium viz dialogue by messages, letters and documents soliloquies and monologues any way less common Viśākhadatta has made full use of all these types of variation in his play as can be observed even by a cursory glance through its pages He has shown great skill in avoiding long speeches in his play It may be seen how in Acts I and II he has made Cānakya and Rākṣasa pass several remarks and ask questions at intervals to their spies and thus saved his play from flowing along the channels of narrative prose And he has done this artistically too, as is evident from the fact that the remarks of the ministers serve a purpose of their own as we have already observed it above Another device used by Viśākhadatta in this connection is the use of letters and documents Thus in Act III instead of himself giving a reply to Candragupta, Cānakya is made to utilise a document[1] for that purpose Similarly a letter is used in Act V It is evident that Viśākhadatta has used these just to avoid the unnaturalness of a character making a long speech on the stage and keeping others idle But the real skill of our author lies in the naturalness with which these devices have been used A message,[2] used in Act I and again in Act II, is again a similar device

Soliloquies and monologues serve the same purpose The

former as a general rule serves to reveal the true spirit or character of a dramatis persona and also serves to give the play a realistic appearance, provided, of course, it is not too long Nothing can be more natural than that while discussing some matter with others or on hearing something from some one, a person should have some thought in his mind which he may not speak out at the moment But it is these thoughts alone that reveal the true character of the person and often mould his future course of action Soliloquy, however, would be tiresome if it is too long Viśākhadatta has, therefore, used what are called monologues, which resemble soliloquies in being speeches by one person only but differ from them in havng the form of a diauogue between the person actually present on the stage and another imaginary person off the stage with the help of the device known as ākāśa-bhāsita [3] This device not only kills monotony, but is also a good economic measure if but sparingly used Viśākhadatta has resorted to this device in his MR four times in the beginning of Acts I, II III and VII

Patākā-sthāna is yet another variation in the medium of thought used in a Sanskrit drama A peculiar juxta-position of a person's words or thought with the words of another sometimes seems to foretell some future event Such a peculiar phenomenon is in Sanskrit dramaturgy called patākā-sthāna This phenomenon is often utilized by Sanskrit play-wrights for intriguing the spectators by the dramatic irony contained therein Visākhadatta has used this device thrice[4] in the first Act and once[5] again in Act IV, and thereby suggested that Cānakya is ultimately to succeed in his aim, defeating and captivating Rākṣasa and Malayaketu, and that Rāksasa would be easily taken in by the plan hatched by him

Having thus far studied the medium of thought and the different variations thereof used by Viśākhadatta we now pass on to a consideration of the order in which the several details

of the plot are presented to us In history and ordinary narrations the order followed is mainly chronological But in plays (and in fact all works of art) the chronological order has to give way to what may be styled as the artistic one Much of a writer's success depends upon the presentation of the various details, and the same story may become attractive or otherwise according to the arrangement of its various details In the MR we are at once taken into the very heart of the theme by Cānakya when he reveals to us his plans in an outline reserving some details which are to be revealed in due course Thus insult of Cānakya at the hands of the Nandas, his vow and alliance with Parvateśvara with a promise of half the Nanda territory, siege of Kusumapura, Sarvārthasiddhi leaving the capital only to be murdered by Cānakya's men in the penance-grove, Rāksasa sending a poison-maiden to Candragupta, but Cānakya directing her to Parvateśvara who succumbs to her, Malayaketu frightened and going away from Kusumapura with Bhāguāyana, Rākṣasa arranging several plans for getting rid of Candragupta and going away from the capital to form an alliance with Malayaketu, leaving his wife and children with Candanadāsa, Cānakya shrewdly arranging for Vairocaka going under the falling arch set up by Rākṣasa's man, frustration of all other plans of Rāksasa through the vigilance of Cānakya and the death of the several accomplices of Rākṣasa by the very means which they intended to use against Candragupta—these are the events that have already taken place at the point where the play begins with the monologue of Cānakya Viśākhadatta has shown his art in not only abandoning the chronological order of these events, but in introducing them all in the body of the play without the least tinge of artificiality What would be more natural than that Cānakya should get from his spy the information of Rākṣasa having left his wife and children at the house of Candanadāsa before leaving Kusumapura? Again we see how

by making Cānakya boastfully refer to the insult he had had at the hands of the Nandas, and how he taking a vow to wreak vengeance fulfilled it single-handed, Viśākhadatta has not only supplied a previous incident so necessary for the understanding of the story but at the same time given some important trait in his character Cānakya is again made to explain how and why Sarvārthasiddhi left the capital and why he got him murdered The art of Viśākhadatta is again seen when we find him introducing several of the remaining details in the form of information gathered by Virādhagupta and delivered to Rākṣasa in Act II Similarly the fact of Parvateśvara succumbing to a poison-maiden has been revealed for the first time in Act I, and again brought in subsequently in Act II and IV In connection with all these details it must be noted that they, one and all, have not only been introduced in a very natural manner, but are at the same time made to serve some useful purpose Thus, for example, the revelation of the facts about the poison-maiden in Act II, besides informing the spectator of that important event has been utilised to bring out the shrewdness of Cānakya and also the appreciative nature of Rāksasa , while the same again has been used to poison the mind of Malayaketu against Rāksasa Viśākhadatta, it may thus be evident, has shown great skill in taking the spectators directly into the heart of the plot and introducing all the previous details later on in the most natural manner

The element of contrast renders great help to a dramatist in sustaining the interest of his spectators , and Viśākhadatta has not been slow to exploit it Looking to the arrangement of the several sections in Act I we can realise how the lighter and the more serious sections are very skilfully intermingled therein Thus the enticing prologue is followed by the more serious monologue of Cānakya which in its turn is followed by the lighter and partly humorous conversation between the spy and the pupil of Cānakya Then follows the more seri-

ous narration the strain of which is slightly relieved by the occurrence of the patākā-sthānas; but the interest is heightened by the revelation of some very important facts. The element of contrast is also observed in the arrangement of the various Acts. Thus Act II though resembling Act I in several respects presents a good contrast to it; for whereas the latter reveals the full self-confidence of Cāṇakya and the success of some of his plans, the former is only a sad tale of a chain of failures of the several plans of Rākṣasa and reveals his lack of self-confidence and fatalism. Act III again brings before us the minister and the king, though loyal, loving and devoted to one another, pretending to be disaffected to the extent of severing connections. Act IV presents a good contrast by showing Malayaketu outwardly acting in a friendly manner towards Rākṣasa though in fact his mind is poisoned against him. Again Act III apparently shows a decline in the fortune of Cāṇakya though the fact is just otherwise; while Act IV, though apparently showing Rākṣasa making for success, has yet taken him nearer his fall. Thus it may be seen that contrast is evident not only between two facts or incidents, but between the fact as it appears to be and the fact as it actually is. Viśākhadatta certainly deserves high praise for introducing this subtle aspect of contrast in his play, the aspect which is a common feature of the political world. It is again interesting to note how he has made his characters more definite and impressive on the basis of this element. We have already seen how Cāṇakya and Candragupta bear a good contrast to Rākṣasa and Malayaketu respectively. We have also noted how the treacherous Bhāgurāyaṇa is taken to be the most trustworthy person by Malayaketu who, however, misreads the most faithful Rākśasa for an infidel. The element of contrast in the hands of Viśākhadatta has its own charming phases and proves a very effective measure for enhancing the interest of the spectators at every stage.

Another element that has contributed not a little towards Viṣākhadatta's success is suspense Thus in Act I are introduced the letter, the seal-ring of Rākṣasa and the ornaments of Parvateśvara by which Cānakya expects to catch Rākṣasa and Malayaketu But at this stage we wonder how this would be accomplished Again we watch with bated breath the conversation or rather the wordy tug-of-war between Candanadāsa and Cānakya the end of which gives us to some extent the clue to the whole plan of the latter The end of the Act also affords a fine illustration of this element when Cāṇakya says 'Sarveṣām śivāh panthānah santu' on learning from his pupil that Bhadrabhaṭa, Bhāgurāyaṇa, and others have absconded In fact this element has been increasingly utilized by Viśākhadatta in his MR Thus from the moment we realize that Malayaketu's mind is gradually being poisoned against the unsuspecting Rākṣasa we are in a suspense which is heightened when Malayaketu thoroughly prejudiced by the revelations in the earlier part of Act V sends for Rākṣasa only to be completely entangled in the whole affair The highest pitch is perhaps reached by the end of the Act when Rākṣasa totally discomfited by the force of circumstances and to his great dismay realises that all his plans have resulted in the destruction, not of the enemies, but of his friends and allies only At this stage we watch with great suspense the line of action that Rākṣasa would decide to follow Viśākhadatta has, indeed exhibited great skill and ability in keeping this suspense at this height through the last two Acts of his play Every moment we are per force kept watching with eagerness what Rākṣasa would do further, we are relieved to learn that Rākṣasa decides to save Candanadāsa, but at the same time wonder how he would do it The sight of his sword affords some relief only to be thwarted by the tale of the man, and the relief that we get at the decision of Rākṣasa to surrender himself for Candanadāsa is only short-lived For it gives rise

to an equally great suspense if not greater and we wonder whether Rākṣasa would choose to sacrifice his life and friend for his principle i e devotion to Nandas or vice versa, and it is not until he declares 'Eṣa prahvo'smi' that we feel much relieved But even here the sudden appearance of Bhadrabhata and others together with captivated Malayaketu and Cāṇakya's leaving the whole affair to Rākṣasa creates some suspense, very mild of course, to be instantly relieved by the magnanimity shown by Rākṣasa It would thus be realised that Viśākhadatta though affording some relief at various intervals and thus lowering the tension on the spectators, has at the same time cleverly managed to keep up the suspense at a high pitch without tiring their patience

Now we pass on to the three unities It is well-known that the idea of three unities as explained originally by the Greek writers has never been strictly adhered to by later play-wrights The unity of action is the only one to be universally realised as the most essential for any good play The other two unities have been respected only in a modified form A reference to the Daśarūpaka will show the unity of time and action have been recognized in Sanskrit in connection with an Act which, we are told, must deal with some incident or incidents forming one connected whole and taking place in one day [6] The third unity is neither referred to in works on dramaturgy nor observed by Sanskrit play-wrights in the strictest sense of the term Turning to the MR it may be observed that Viśākhadatta has carefully observed the unity of time by taking care to see that no act in his play represents action extending beyond the span of a day He has also depicted one main point in each Act as can be seen from the names that he has given them, and thus observed the unity of action also As for place it must be noted that as far as possible Viśākhadatta has avoided any disconcerting change of place within an Act Thus the scene in Act I is laid at the house of Cāṇakya in Pāṭali-

putra while in Act III it is partly at the royal palace and partly at Cāṇakya's house in Pātaliputra, and the last two Acts represent action taking place partly in a street in Pāṭali-putra, partly in an old garden in its outskirts, partly at the place of execution, and partly at the royal palace The scene of action in Acts II and IV is partly a street in Malayaketu's territory and partly Rākṣasa's dwelling therein, whereas the fifth Act represents action taking place partly in Malayaketu's camp, partly in a pavilion in the camp, and partly in Rākṣasa's dwelling there Thus on the whole it may be seen that the place of action in the MR as a whole falls into three broad sections viz Pātaliputra, Malayaketu's capital, and Malaya-ketu's camp between the two and nearer to the former[7] This change in the place, however, does not mar the impression of unity of action and hence Viśākhadatta may be said to have observed the unity of place in this play

Let us now analyse the time element in the MR It has been already observed that no Act in the MR represents ac-tion extending beyond the span of a day Now we have to look to the play as a whole and find out the time that is re-quired by the action that is actually represented on the stage and also the time that is required by plot at a whole As for the former it may be observed that Viśākhadatta has used his ingenuity to present maximum amount of action possible within the available scope of the seven Acts of his play, partly by using stage directions and partly by a skilful arrangement of the various incidents Thus, for example, when Cāṇakya ex-presses his desire to see Candanadāsa, his pupil at once goes out and comes again on the stage with Candanadāsa in no time In fact all this would require some time according to the distance at which Candanadāsa is residing But Viśākha-datta has brought all this within the compass of a minute with the stage direction 'Niṣkramya candanadāsena saha praviśya' and thus saved so much time Several, indeed, are the places

where Viśākhadatta has resorted to this device but in this connection it should be noted that they, all but one, occur in Acts I, and V which are over-crowded with incidents Act III has this only once, while the other Acts do not have it at all The The use of such a stage direction as an economic measure is rather artificial and hence mars the semblance of reality created by a play Constant use of such a device may, therefore, be taken as a blemish in the art of a play-wright , and Viśākhadatta has committed the sin of using it at least ten times[8] This defect, however, dwindles into insignificance when we look to the skill exhibited by him in arranging the several incidents in his play Thus in Act IV, for example, we see how while Rākṣasa is trying to recall the mission on which he had sent Karabhaka, Malayaketu is shown going to see him, and how just when the latter reaches the place the former is made to remember the mission and put a question to Karabhaka This is again used as an excuse for Malayaketu to wait outside, so that what follows is a bifocal scene with Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana on one side of the stage and Rākṣasa with Karabhaka and Śakatadasa on the other And as soon as Rākṣasa is alone Malayaketu enters and has his talk with him The bifocal scene in Act V is yet another illustration of Viśākhadatta's skill in this respect It is with these contrivances that Viśākhadatta has succeeded in giving us within the span of a perid of a few hours incidents or action which in actuality would require a much longer period

As for the time required by the whole plot of the MR it should not be very difficult for us to determine it approximately on the strength of the various references to some particular dates and also the mention of a definite period having elapsed from a particular incident together with the mention of the same persons at one place in one Act and at another several miles apart in another Of direct references to the actual date we have three , one in Act I which speaks of the

possibility of the moon-eclipse[9] on that day which, therefore, must be the full moon day, another in Act III which speaks of the Day of the Kaumudī festival[10] which is the full moon day of Kārtika, and lastly in Act IV where the Ksapanaka directly gives the full moon day[11] as the best day for starting the proposed expedition Another pertinent reference in this connection we come across in a remark of Malayaketu when he declares that it was then ten months since his father died[12] Side by side with these references we have to note that Siddhārthaka with Śakatadāsa has left Kusumapura on the very day on which the action in Act I takes place, and it is perhaps on the same day again that Cāṇakya has sent somebody with the ornaments of Parvateśvara which he has secured through Viśvāvasu and his brothers All these, it may further be remembered, are seen in Malayaketu's capital in Act II Similarly the message[13] sent by Rākṣasa from Malayaketu's land has reached Stavakalaśa before the feigned quarrel takes place in Act III Again Karabhaka, sent by Stavakalaśa after the quarrel in Act III from Kusumapura, is seen in Malayaketu's land in the beginning of Act IV, and Malayaketu and his army that start from their land at the end of Act IV[14] are near Kusumapura in the beginning of Act V[15] And lastly Siddhārthaka and Rākṣasa who have left Malayaketu's camp at the end of Act V are in Kusumapura in Act VI, and Malayaketu himself continuing his expedition at the end of Act V is brought a captive to Kusumapura before Candragupta in the end[16] The distance between Kusumapura and Malayaketu's capital is about a hundred yojanas and one would require at least ten to fifteen days to go from the former to the latter[17]

There can be no doubt that the day of the action in Act III is the day of the Kaumudī-festival i e the full moon day of the month of Kārtika Now allowing due time for Virādhagupta to go from Rākṣasa to Kusumapura and find time to

convey Rākṣasa's word to Stavakalaśa we may take the action in Act II as taking place a fortnight earlier, and that in Act I should be fortnight earlier still in view of the fact of Śakatadāsa and Siddhārthaka having come from Kusumapura (in Act I) to Rākṣasa (in Act II) Thus now the action in the first three Acts may be said to have taken place on the full moon day of Āśvina, the new moon day of the same month and the full moon day of the Kārtika respectively A period of about a month must have elapsed between Acts III and IV and about a fortnight again between Acts IV and V, to allow Karabhaka to go from Kusumapura to Rāksasa and also to allow Malayaketu's camp to move from his capital and be near Kusumapura That Acts IV and V are separated by about a fortnight is again shown by the remark of Malayaketu that he has not seen Rākṣasa for a long time [18] That the action in Act VII takes place on the same day as that in Act VI is shown by the remark of the puruṣa in Act VI viz 'Adya tāvad vyāpādyate' [19] A gap of a day or two seems to be necessary between Acts V and VI in view of the fact that Siddhārthaka and Rākṣasa have come to Kusumapura from Malayaketu's camp which they have left at the end of Act V, and also that the former has not only seen Cānakya but also (at his command) informed Candragupta of various incidents before he meets his friend Samiddhārthaka in the interlude in Act VI [20] Thus it may be seen that the period of the Action covered by the drama actually extends from the full moon day of Āśvina to the end of Mārgaśīrṣa or thereabouts But as we have already seen above there are various incidents which have already taken place before the action represented in Act I, and which are only narrated on the stage later on under various devices From Malayaketu's remark in Act IV (the full moon day of Mārgaśīrṣa) that it was ten months since the death of his father we can conclude that Parvateśvara succumbed to the poison-maiden sometime about the

middle of Phālguna But on Cāṇakya's own statement[21] the death of Parvateśvara occurred some time after Sarvārthasiddhi had left the capital for tapovana only to be killed there by his men It, therefore, follows that the siege of Kusumapura by Candragupta must have commenced about the middle of Mārgaśīrṣa, nearly two months before the death of Parvateśvara And making due allowance for Cāṇakya to make strong preparations for this siege by catching hold of Candragupta and forming an alliance with Parvateśvara, we may reasonably hold that the incident of Cāṇakya being insulted by the Nandas must have taken place somewhere about the middle of Kārtika, the time of the Kaumudī festival On the whole now we may conclude that the plot of the MR (including the incidents that are merely introduced in the body of the play as matters of the past) covers a little over thirteen months from one Kaumudi festival approximately to about a month and a half after that very festival next year, though the incidents actually represented on the stage do not exceed a span of only about two months and half from the middle of Āśvina to the end of Mārgaśīrṣa

Unity of action is perhaps the strongest point in the art of Viśākhadatta Not that there are no minor episodes introduced by him in the MR , but they are one and all kept strictly subservient to the main strory Thus, for example, there are the stories of Candanadāsa, Śakatadāsa and Malayaketu , but they, one and all, have been very cleverly interwoven with one another and again with the main story in such a way that they all together appear to form one story Every incident and every thing that is introduced in the play ultimately leads to only one thing viz the winning over of Rākṣasa by Cāṇakya While reading the play at every point we feel as if we are witnessing a game at chess between two great experts who are moving their men with great fore-

thought with the ultimate aim of giving a crushing defeat to the opponent Just as every move in such a play is only a part and parcel of the whole game, similarly in this play also each and every incident is only a part and parcel of the main theme viz the contest between the two politicians As the play proceeds Viśākhadatta has given a number of details one after another and also introduced several things which hardly seem to be connected with one another or even with the main theme Thus in Act I are introduced the ornaments of Parvateśvara and we hardly suspect that they are going to play any important role in Cāṇakya's scheme Similarly the ornaments of Malayaketu in Act II, the very ring of Rākṣasa, the feigned quarrel and the consequent split between Cāṇakya and Candragupta afford fine illustrations of the skill of Viśākhadatta so far as the unity of action is concerned It is not until the fifth Act that Viśākhadatta stops spreading out the cob-web of things and events and begins to bring them together and lead them on to the denouement If we look at the several Acts from the point of view of the development of the plot as leading to the ultimate aim, we may observe that Act I marks only the beginning where we get a good idea of the plans of Cāṇakya, but are yet ignorant of Rākṣasa's plans Act II shows a deterioration in the situation of Rākṣasa whose prospects seem to grow brighter from the end of that Act upto the end of Act III Act IV shows how though Rākṣasa feels that he is heading for success, certain other events are taking place without the knowledge of Rākṣasa which make his success doubtful in the eye of the spectators Act V completely shatters the hopes of Rākṣasa and makes him think of saving his friend Candanadāsa Thus the aim is partly achieved It only remains now to convince Rākṣasa that there was no other way of saving his friend but to surrender—not only his own person, but even his main contention, his aim to remain faithful to his old masters even after their annihila-

tion—and accept the ministership of Candragupta That done, Cāṇakya relinquishes his ministership in favour of Rākṣasa and ties his hair as a sign of the fulfilment of his vow

This brings us to a consideration of the construction of the MR according to Sanskrit works on dramaturgy Viśākhadatta has shown his deep acquaintance with the dramatic technique at IV 3 where he has compared the strain that a minister like Rākṣasa has to undergo with that of a good play-wright According to this theory there are five arthaprakṛtis[22] and an equal number of kāryāvasthās,[23] and a combination of these each to each serially gives rise to what are technically called the sandhis,[24] which also are, consequently, five in number Thus the first sandhi, the mukha, is formed by a combination of bīja and ārambha[25] In Act I Cānakya, after making a statement of his aim, has made a beginning of his plan, and fortunately enough has received from his spy the signet ring of Rākṣasa, an event which may be said to mark the beginning of the ultimate attainment of his aim by Cānakya This portion of Act I forms the mukha-sandhi Next in order is the pratimukha sandhi which combines in itself bindu and yatna[26] This covers the rest of Act I where the narration of the spy apparently supervenes the main purpose which is revived by what follows Thus the forging of the document with a mention of the ornaments therein, sending away of Siddhārthaka with the document and the seal ring with some important instructions kept secret at this stage, and the absconding of Bhadrabhata and Bhāgurāyaṇa and others—all these are in fact so many links in the scheme of Cāṇakya to fetter Rākṣasa Patākā and Prāptyāśā form the Garbha sandhi[27] which here covers the whole of Act II The narration of Virādhagupta forms the patākā, which in this case appears again to throw into background the main purpose, while the prāptyāśā is found in II 2 and the following sentence, and also in II 8 and the speech of Rākṣasa that

precedes it The next two Acts form the Vimarśa sandhi[28] which combines in itself prakarī and niyatāpti, which are to be found in Act III and the conversation between Rākṣasa and his spy in Act IV respectively The last is the nirvahana sandhi[29] which is kārya and phalāgama put together This occurs in the remaining three Acts Act V accomplishes the avāntara kārya viz the nigraha of Malayaketu, in the next Act is accomplished the main object viz the winning over of Rākṣasa, while the last Act brings about the fruit most ardently wished for by Cānakya viz making Rākṣasa accept Candragupta's ministership and thus making the latter's position secure and firm It may be remarked here that Viśākhadatta's play may be pointed out as one of the finest illustrations of the Sanskrit dramatic technique[30]

We have now to note one more measure of economy that has been adopted by Viśākhadatta in his MR and thus succeeded in creating a cobweb of entangling situations calculated to keep up the interest of the spectator all through the play It is the introduction of some very important things in the most innocent manner and making them serve several purposes one after another and pass through several hands Thus in Act I is introduced the signet ring of Rākṣasa by making the spy hand it over to Cānakya with full information about it It is used there again to seal a letter which is to be later on used against Rākṣasa, and is then through Siddhārthaka made to pass into the hands of Rākṣasa who is made to give it to his friend and writer Śakatadāsa with an instruction to use it in all further transactions Before giving it to Rākṣasa, however, Siddhārthaka is made to use it to seal the ornament received by him from the latter Thus the ring is used for the purpose of setting a seal to the letter and the ornament-box, both of which later on serve as evidence against Rākṣasa himself It has thus an interesting journey of its own in Acts I II and V The ornaments of Parvateśvara come next They

are introduced, (but not actually produced and shown on the stage), in Act I very innocently again inasmuch as at that time we are hardly conscious of the great disaster that they are going to bring upon Rākṣasa in Act V The very fact that Cānakya has sent Brāhmanas of his acquaintance to receive them from Candragupta and asked them to see him with them, does give rise to a feeling that they are to form part of Cānakya's machinery, but we do not realize their importance at this stage Thus the ornaments naturally fall into the possession of Candragupta after the demise of Parvateśvara, and from him through Viśvāvasu and his brothers they go to Cānakya who arrange to send them to Malayaketu's land only to be bought by Śakatadāsa for Rākṣasa whose fall they are to bring ultimately These ornaments also we see passing through several hands and serving different purposes in Acts I, II, and V Nor are the ornaments of Malayaketu any way less important from the dramatic point of view In Act II Malayaketu is made to send the ornaments from his own person to Rākṣasa as a sign of friendship with a pressing request that Rāksasa should put on the same It is towards the end of the same Act that Rākṣasa is made to part with it in his ecstacy at the rescue of his dear friend Śakatadāsa from the clutches of Cānakya and the jaws of death Siddhārthaka is, however, made to seal the same with the ring of Rākṣasa himself then in his possession and deposit it in the treasury of Rākṣasa himself with a plausible excuse It is later on in Act V that we see Siddhārthaka moving out with this ornament-box with Rāksasa's seal and trying to go out to Kusumapura apparently on an errand of Rākṣasa, but without a passport Naturally, therefore, he is caught and produced before Bhāgurāyana who cross-examines him Siddhārthaka then cleverly drops the ornament-box which is naturally construed by Malayaketu in the light of a statement in the letter recovered from him Inspite of Rākṣasa's explanation Malayaketu is

firmly convinced that Rākṣasa was sending the ornament to Candragupta as a present accompanying the letter The importance of the letter forged by Cāṇakya through Śakaṭadasa can hardly be exaggerated For it is this letter that turns the whole scale against Rākṣasa by thoroughly prejudicing Malayaketu's mind against him, and making Malayaketu construe other matters also differently in that light This letter when it is read out in Act V throws a flood of light on the whole plan of Cāṇakya to cause a split between Malayaketu on the one hand and Rākṣasa and his other Mleccha allies on the other , and we are struck by the keen insight commanded and displayed by Cāṇakya in devising this plan almost on the spur of the moment in Act I

From the point of view of stage-craft we have to note in the MR three different factors viz stage directions, sudden shifting of scenes from one place to another, and the bifocal scenes The stage directions refer not only to the speeches which may be svagata, prakāśa or janāntika,[31] nor again to the entrance or exit of dramatis personae or the manner of their entrance or appearance on the stage, but even to the facial expressions and other signs such as the throbbing of the left eye Some also refer to some noise behind the curtain With these stage directions one will be justified in concluding that the play is meant to be acted on the stage , and this conclusion finds confirmation in the very opening sentence in the prologue They also show that the stage had a curtain (screening the tiring room) which could be tossed aside[32] for the purposes of hurried entrance by a character on the stage, and also another short curtain called javanikā with a window-like hole in it[33] This latter appears to have been moveable so that a person could stand screened by it as long as he wanted, but could set it aside at will and appear on the stage[34]

More than once in the MR we see the scene of action shifting suddenly from one place to another Thus in Act III, for

example, we find the scene shifting from the sugānga palace to the abode of Cānakya, and from there again back to the palace Similarly in Act V it shifts from Malayaketu s place to Rāksasa's abode there, and then back again to Malayaketu's place Such sudden shifts in immediate sequence can be represented on the stage with the help of curtains only Thus it follows that beside the nepathya and the javanikā, the Indian stage was also equipped with one or two more curtains which could be dropped or lifted according to the requirements of the play [35]

The bifocal scenes pre-suppose a still further development in stage-craft Thus in Act IV, for example, we see how while Rāksasa is holding conversation with Virādhagupta in this abode, Malayaketu and Bhāgurāyana standing outside are over-hearing them and passing remarks on what they hear A similar scene occurs in Act V also with Bhāgurāyana on one side and Malayaketu and Ksapanaka on the other In such cases the spectators are expected to witness all the persons on the stage (i e those inside as well as those outside) but the persons on one side are not expected to see or hear the persons on the other side, and vice versa Hence it follows that the stage must have been divided into two parts (right and left) both facing the spectators and separated from each other by a curtain The stage in Ancient India thus appears to have been fairly well developed and equipped with curtains for different purposes

We now close this chapter by making a few observations about Viśākhadatta as a poet It is clear that he can never rise to the height and sublimity of Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti In prose as well as in poetry his is a laboured style, more befitting a scientific than a literary work His prose abounds in technical terms, expressions, and ideas , and though free from very lengthy sentences, or involved constructions, is yet full of compounds of varying length His poetry is more artificial

still and hence more difficult also This defect he has tried to make up by the width and depth of his scholarship, using a large number of alamkāras like upamā, rūpaka, utpreksā, ślesa, arthāntara-nyāsa, aprastuta-praśamsā and samāsokti He has also used a large variety of metres ranging from the anuṣṭubh to the sragdharā (among the samavrttas), only two among the visama vrttas viz the mālyabhārinī and the puṣpitāgrā, and the vipulā and the pathyā varieties of the āryā meter In this connection it may be observed that Viśākhadatta in the MR has shown a partiality for the lengthy metres like the sragdhrā and the śārdūla-vikrīdita Befitting the laboured style he has often drawn on nyāya, arthaśāstra, nātya and jyotih-śāstra for his similes and metaphors and in several cases indulged in ślesa which becomes boresome when reduced to a mere word jugglery Viśākhadatta's style is rugged and forceful on the whole, and he can hardly rank among the best Sanskrit poets with his occasional tautologies, and forced double entendre, though he may easily be admitted to stand very high among the stars of the second magnitude in the galaxy of Sanskrit play-wrights

CHAPTER VII

SOCIETY AS DEPICTED IN THE MUDRĀ-RĀKṢASA

In an admittedly political play like the MR it is but impossible to find a full reflection of the society in all its aspects But at the same time it is a matter of general experience that no literary work of any value can be thoroughly devoid of any glimpses of the contemporary state of society We may, therefore, make an attempt here on the basis of the glimpses available in the MR to depict the social, religious and political conditions obtaining in the day of Viśākhadatta

Caste-system was not only fully developed but even had a thorough hold on the society The Brāhmanas were held in high esteem and respect by the rest of the society On festive and religious occasions they were invited for dinner and given good dakṣinā At obsequial rites the ornaments and other things belonging to the departed souls were given to them as religious gifts Some Brāhmanas were well up in politics and other śāstras and worked as ministers or even spies Others were learned in the Vedic lore only, and as a rule were notorious for their illegible hand [1] The Kāyastha, on the other hand, was noted for beautiful hand-writing, though he seems to have carried little weight in the sphere of politics [2] The Vanik was generally noted for his cupidity, and amassed vast amount of wealth When however occasion demanded it, he was also prepared to stake every thing belonging to him—nay even his wife and children For the sake of a friend he would undergo any risk, and would even consign himself to fire or hang himself to death just to avoid hearing the harrowing news of a friend's execution The worse side of the caste-system, however, is seen when we find that untouchability is

also present and that Candālas (and presumably persons of some other classes also) are regarded as untouchable[3]

Religious sacraments and observances are also casually referred to in our play Thus on festival days or on religious occasions like the moon-eclipse it was customary to ask Brāhmanas to dinner and give them dakṣinā Religious rites were also performed with reference to the departed relatives and even friends and allies, though sometimes such rites were deferred with a view to wreak vengeance on the wrong-doer[4] At such obsequal rites it was customary to give away to learned Brāhmanas the ornaments and other belongings of the deceased Importance of religious gifts was generally recognized so much so that a man before immolating himself often gave away all his wealth to the poor[5]

The custom of anumaraṇa seems to have been fairly common Friends often consigned themselves to fire or hanged themselves to death for the sake of a friend whom they could render no active help in his worst calamity Inspite of what Kālidāsa and Bāna have said against this custom of anumaraṇa, even women had recourse to this expedient in the full belief that to follow the husband in his death (or negatively, not to desert him at the point of death) is only a duty of a true wife![6] Nay anumarana is nothing short of ātmānugraha[7] One consideration which might prevail against this course is only a young helpless child But there seem to have been cases where even this consideration carried no weight[8] This custom does not, however, seem to have been compulsory for all, and hence we find Malayaketu's mothers not immolating themselves and continuing to live even after the death of his father. It is perhaps likely that the custom was prevalent more among the Āryas than among the Mlecchas

Nothing is known from the play as regards the forms of marriage prevailing at that time But from a simile[9] in Act I it appears that a married woman was expected to be very

quietly and modestly waiting on her husband and the elderly persons of the family Re-marriage seems to be allowed within the gotra or family of the deceased husband on certain conditions for all classes of people, and it was only women of low classes or character that transgressed this rule and took the liberty of marrying even outside the gotra of their deceased husband [10]

Nor are theistic ideas wanting in our play God Śiva holding both the Ganges and the śaśikalā on his head is described as indulging in a crooked speech with his wife, the simple Pārvatī [11] Another stanza[12] describes his body smeared with bhasma, covered in elephant's hide, and decked with a garland of skulls God Viṣṇu also is described as just waking up in his serpent bed, his eyes reddish and only half opened , [13] while the Varāha incarnation of the same god is referred to in the bharata-vākya [14] People generally paid obeisance to the new moon,[15] and the sun also was an object of worship [16]

Partly credulous is the idea of the God of Death and his pata Man can live only through his favour , for it is he who snatches away the lives of all, even those of the devotees of other deities [17] Yamapata is used as a means of livelihood even as we find it sometimes used even to-day This only shows how people then had strong though credulous belief in the accounts of the tortures of hell described in purānas and and vividly painted in the yamapata Yama was helped in his work by Citragupta who kept a record of all the persons whose lives are to be snatched away [18]

Of the heterodox system only two are referred to in the play Buddhism seems to have been in a flourishing condition and enjoying a general approval The conduct of a Buddha was looked upon as being remarkably above reproach—nay even worthy of approbation [19] Jainism also was fairly spread , though it does not seem to enjoy the same honour and respect as its compeer The sight of a kṣapanaka was considered an

ill omen[20] The main reason for this prejudice, however, seems to be the loathsome sight (bībhatsa darśana) that he presented, so much so that if he did not present a loathsome sight his appearance was not so much detested[21] On the whole, however, people seem to have imbibed a spirit of tolerance towards of all sects—a fact which generally may be said to be the badge of Hinduism, as can be inferred from the fact that even a kṣapanaka could not only be a servant and friend of a Brāhmana minister, but be even his spy

Various credulous beliefs also are found to be prevailing The moon-eclipse, it was believed, was caused by the wicked graha Ketu overpowering (and swallowing) the moon[22] Feeding Brāhmanas on such occasions was considered as a religious duty The idea of ill omens also was present Thus the sight of a serpent,[23] or that of a Kṣapanaka was considered inauspicious The same was the case with the throbbing of the left eye[24] Another such credulity is represented in the MR by what is known as a patākā-sthāna[25] The occurrence of several of these in the MR and the remarks on those occasions passed by persons like Cānakya and Rākṣasa may easily be admitted as being suggestive of the belief of the generality of people in their prophetic powers[25]

Among the family relations the wife was very loving and dutiful towards her husband She gave her husband a hearty send off when he set out on a journey, and returned home after seeing him off upto a certain distance During his absence from home she naturally looked after the household and her children When, however, the husband was going out never to return (as when being led to the impaling station) she would not return home She would rather keep him company even in his death leaving even her young children to the care of the Almighty[26] This course, however, was not followed by all, and in the MR also we see the mothers of Malayaketu continuing to live even after their sad bereavement, pos-

sibly with a desire to see with their own eyes their son avenging the wrong perpetrated by the enemy Nor was the husband less loving or dutiful Before going away from home he would, if necessary, arrange for the safety of his wife (and also children), and sometimes would even keep them with a friend Though himself in adverse circumstances he would try to consol and cheer up his wife and also to dissuade her from immolating herself at least for the sake of the children if for nothing else The father as a rule cared for the welfare of his children, and if he chanced to meet an unusual kind of death, he would be always careful to impress on the mind of his son that he was meeting his end not for any fault of his, but for some noble cause Character was the most important thing in his eye, and his one desire was that his children should not think of him as a moral wreck The son, on the other hand, was all respect for the father, and was also obedient to him Naturally he would feel quite helpless at the idea of his going to meet an untoward end, and would request him if possible, to give him some last piece of guidance and advice, particularly as to what he should do thereafter He would, of course, be all pride at the idea that his father has been upright all his life through and was sacrificing himself in the cause of a friend, and would take it as a family vow It is needless to add that mother was loving towards her children and served as a guide to him, particularly in the absence of her husband When, however, caught between the Schylla and the Charibdis of two duties (that to her husband and that to her children) she would care more for the former and leave the children to the care of gods

More important still is a friend whose touch-stone is adversity Very few indeed, are there who would even care to see a person in his adversity, much less speak to him a few consoling words or render any active help[27] Others merely shed tears finding themselves unable to render any active help[28]

But truer friends would undergo any risk for the sake of a friend They would remain faithful even at the risk of losing not only their wealth, or wife and children, but even their life [29] It is no wonder then if one left one's wife and children in the house of such a friend before undertaking a serious task involving great risk Friends, particularly when meeting after a long period of separation, naturally enough expressed their love and concern for one another and, sometimes even went to the length of blaming one another for causing delay [30] This blame is, after all, only more apparent than real, and soon the friends plunged into deeper matters acquainting one another with the important matters and events that they might have come to know during the period of separation Some friends are so very loving and tender-hearted that they simply can't bear the idea of having to hear the harrowing news of the execution of a friend, and to avoid it, therefore, would either consign themselves to fire or hang themselves to death [31]

Sometimes a friend might unwittingly do something which would bring a person into trouble, and thus create a misunderstanding about himself and his fidelity in the eye of that person The more fortunate ones[32] among such friends may live to see the fog lifted, but the less fortunate ones[33] might succumb to the evil effects of the misunderstanding without getting any chance of clearing themselves Faithless friends, however, are not wanting Outwardly such persons profess to be good friends and are sweet-tongued, so that they are hardly suspected to be otherwise than what they appear to be But it is such so-called friends alone that by their alluring speeches and talks often mislead a person and lead him to his ruin

There is nothing striking if a man risks his all—even his life—for a friend who has shown his friendship by similar actions But the more magnanimous type of friend would go a step further and even forgive the insults and injuries inflicted on him by a former friend and ally, now turned into an enemy [34]

Servants, as a general rule, appear to have been more faithful than otherwise to their original masters, though they may also be found to act treacherously to the masters in whose employ they put themselves under some pretext or the other They are in all matters so completely subservient to their masters that they can't even make a free use of their sense-organs, and very often have to stifle their conscience[55] Naturally therefore, several of them seem to be devoid of any conscience whatever, though there are a few who are yet subject to the pricking of their conscience, which, of course, they are obliged to suppress in view of their servitude A servant, it seems, could have no sense of self-respect, and had to do any thing or assume any role—even the meanest one—in implicit obedience to his master's will[36] A dog's living is, indeed, a synonym for service in Sanskrit[37]

Masters were, no doubt, very often quite considerate and even kind to their servants But some masters like Cānakya were more feared than loved Masters were not, however, wanting, who were soft-hearted and would be touched to the quick at the sad plight of their servants They were also generous and gave away presents to their servants for bringing some glad tidings or doing some good service

One more relation of which we catch a glimpse in the MR is that between the teacher and the taught The latter was generally all respect for the former, and had great regard for his learning[38] He gave implicit obedience to his preceptor and in return received vidyā from him There are, however, certain cases where disciples paid scant courtesy to their preceptors and insulted them[39] though good pupils like Candragupta would look upon such an action as a grave crime[40] The preceptor, on the other hand, seems to have had full control over his disciple, who often stayed with him Naturally he would rather be short-tempered with his disciple, though some of his kind, being conscious of their defect, tried

to check themselves and appeared apologetic whenever they happened to fall a prey to it [41]

We don't get a clear idea of the various professions followed in those days But we find the play referring to some of them viz Yamapaṭa, serpent-play, astrology, medicine, and so on The idea about these that we get from the play does not differ much from what we know of them even to-day The same may be said about festivals in general as can be inferred from what we know of the Kaumidī festival

Flesh-eating was common, and flesh was regularly sold in shops [42] Drinking was looked upon as a vice, but at public festivals or on feastive occasions people seem to have indulged in wine to some extent Woman and hunting are vices and were generally avoided by the people Royal servants in particular had to be above all these vyasanas, and those who were found addicted to any of these were liable to be punished [43]

The play is steeped in a political atmosphere all through, and we not only come across several technical terms of politics but even a very large number of political ideas as also a good deal of information about kings, ministers, and spies in particular

The king was an absolute monarch, and had full control over his subjects Some kings, however, did not look to the administration themselves, but left it wholly to their ministers [44] and remained engrossed in enjoyment and festivals Such kings naturally were completely dependent on their ministers, so much so that they were at times even insulted by the latter in case they questioned the accuracy or advisability of the course that was being followed Under these circumstances the kings had either to swallow the insult or punish the overbearing ministers In fact the king could not only dismiss his minister but even sentence him to death,[45] though the latter course was only sparingly adopted More generally

perhaps the affairs of the state were conducted by the king in consultation with his minister From the point of view of his relation with his minister thus the king was ether svāya-ttasiddhi, sacivāyattasiddhi, or ubhayāyattasiddhi

The commands of a king were proclaimed at various places (called ghoṣaṇā-sthānas) and were implicitly obeyed [46] Even the slightest disrespect shown to his command was sure to rouse his indignation, and bring ruin on the culprit As a general rule the king was devoted to the well-being of his subjects, and in return expected from them nothing but full loyalty [47] Some kings, no doubt, were covetous and cared more for the wealth of their subjects than any thing else Rājāpathya, however, was in any case a very serious offence and would bring total annihilation on its perpetrator Everybody therefore avoided rājāpathya (treason in general) at least to save himself and his family, if for nothing else [48] A king's lot, however, was not considered to be very enviable, particularly if he would be a king in the real sense of the term [49]

If the king was the first member of the state (pradhāna prakrti), the minister was the next in order In practice sometimes he was all in all, particularly when the king remained completely indifferent to the affairs of the state But even when the king was quite alive to his duties as a king, the minister had his own importance and responsibilities, so much so that it was he who was held generally responsible for any wrong committed by the king [50] He was, therefore, as a rule expected to be not only shrewd and brave but also, above all, loyal[51] to his king, and it was not quite easy to find a person endowed with all these qualities The idea that kings were often swayed by their ministers is hinted at by Viśākhadatta by comparing the former with elephants or serpents and the latter with mahats or snake-catchers [52] Ministers were expected to be upright and disinterested, though some fell very

snort of their requirements and did nothing better than lavishing eulogies on their lord and bread-giver[53]

The fate of the state depended not merely on the king, nor again merely on the abilities of the minister, but on both, on their mutual and hearty co-operation and confidence How-so-ever clever a minister may be, he is sure to be defeated in his aims and undertakings if he finds himself associated with an unworthy prince Mutual distrust between the king and his minister always results in a political breakdown of the state, while mutual confidence will lead even less talented ministers to success[54] Thus inspite of the absolute monarchy that apparently was the rule of the day, it seems to have been held that the king should follow the rājadharmas and do every thing in consultation with his ministers

Spies are often described as the eyes of the king, and are of great use and importance in the political world A spy was expected to be adept in languages of the different parts of the country and expert in assuming various disguises[55] This was but natural because he was required to go to different parts of the land and gather information by moving among various kinds of people He generally assumed such disguises as would enable him to have a free access to any place, even that of a minister, and would at the same time be above all suspicion And the best disguises seem to have been those of a snake-catcher, a yāmapaṭika, or a religious mendicant—even buddhist or jain—or an astrologer who had access to all houses and could talk to all sorts of people high and low Inspite of the detailed instructions that they received from their employers, the spies had often to use their own ingenuity and decide the course of action to be followed on the spur of the moment They were, therefore, required to be men of good calibre At times spies were required to get themselves employed in the service of the enemy and do their work very cautiously, sometimes even at the risk of their own lives The slightest mis-

take on the part of a spy in such cases would not only cost his life, but even frustrate the whole plan of his master and bring destruction on the state Thus we see that spies had to play a very active part in the political world by wandering through different people under various disguises and gathering information, or by getting into the services of the enemy in different departments and waiting for an opportune moment to carry out the instructions of their master Implicit obedience and staunch fidelity were strictly expected from the spies and any one showing the slightest sign to the contrary ran the risk of being sentenced to death

Punishments seems to have been very severe—nay cruel Flogging was common and was generally resorted to for extorting confessions from a culprit and also for wringing the required information from him Confiscation of all the belongings, imprisonment together with wife and children, and expulsion were the usual punishments for a person suspected of sedition Nor is capital punishment less common It generally was awarded in the form of impalement , but in particular cases it took the form of poisoning,[56] burning or burying alive,[57] or tying to the feet of an elephant [58] A person sentenced to death was led to the vadhya-sthāna dressed in red garments with a garland of red flowers and the śūla on his neck[59] through the main street of the town proclaiming at several places the crimes committed by him and also the punishment awarded to him Offenders could as a general rule be ransomed with large amounts of money , but this was not allowed in the case of persons accused of sedition, who could secure their release only by proving by their action that they were not seditious [60] Recluses and monks seem to have been exempted from capital punishment, the highest punishment in their case being expulsion from the land with disgrace All punishments were given by the minister, but the capital punishment seems to have been a special prerogative of the

king[61] even when he has left the whole administrative affair to his minister On feastive occasions all prisoners were released unconditionally [62]

The army consisted of four parts, elephants, cavalry, chariots and infantry Of these, however, the first two seem to have been more highly valued than the others [63] These together with territory and treasure formed the strength of a king, and hence it is these that these were always coveted and prized more than any thing else [64] The sword and the bow seem to have been the most common weapons of war, and a coat of mail was also common The art of war-fare was not restricted to this or that particular class, and even Brāhmanas appear to be quite well up in it They even at times led an expedition themselves [65] The Mlecchas on the whole seem to have been held in a low esteem by the Āryas,[66] though alliance between the Āryas and the Mlecchas appears to be quite common Defeated monarchs were taken captives before the victorious kings who sometimes took a lenient view and ordered them to be released or even re-instated But as a general rule it would appear that the principalities of such princes were annexed to that of the victor, and even when the former were allowed to retain them, their position would be only subordinate to the latter

Among the flora and fauna our play mentions only the lion,[67] the elephant—particularly its two varieties vyāla[68] and eka-cara,[69] the honey-making bees,[70] the sārasa,[71] the haṃsa[72] and the pea-cock [73] The geographical references[74] in the play include Cīna, Kulūta, Sindhudeśa, Malaya, and Kāśmīra in addition to the city of Pāṭaliputra, the mountain Himālaya,[75] the rivers Śoṇa[76] and the Gangā,[77] and the Southern ocean [78] Besides the Hūnas we find Śakas, Śabaras, Khaśas, Gāndhāras, and Yavanas[79] mentioned by Viśākhadatta and referred to by the general term Mleccha, which would appear to have been applied to all foreigners in general The concluding stanza of

the play tells us that the prince, during whose reign it was composed, had rescued the earth from the scourge of the Mleccha, who had been harrassing it time and again [80]

After this broad survey of the state of society as depicted in the MR a few words must be said to do away with the misunderstanding that the MR depicts a state of society marked by low morality Such a conclusion regarding the state of society in general is vitiated by the fact that MR is mainly a political play, and whatever morally objectionable actions have occurred therein, have one and all occurred in the sphere of politics only It is, therefore, wrong on the basis of these actions to draw any conclusions regarding the society in general outside the sphere of politics If, on the other hand, we look to the other incidents and characters outside the political atmosphere and also the thoughts and actions entertained by the politicians themselves in their private and individual capacities we find the code of morality certainly very enviable Fidelity loyalty, truthfulness, firmness, sincerity, love and fellow-feeling, and the spirit of self-sacrifice are the qualities noticeable in almost every character high or low Even those who have displayed the qualities of cruelty, treachery, infidelity, ingratitude, falsehood and forgery have done so only out of some political reasons, and not for their private or personal gain or animosity Even these characters it must be noted, in their personal capacities, divested of their political responsibilities and purposes have shown a high standard of morality as can be easily seen from the fact that minister of the position of Cāṇakya lived in but a poor hut, and refused to bend even before the sovereign, [81] that a spy like Bhāgurāyaṇa feels the sting of his conscience that he has to act treacherously towards the fully confiding Malayaketu, [82] that an ordinary spy like Samiddhārthaka is enraged at the idea that he should be asked to commit the heinous act of murdering a good man like Candanadāsa,[83] that a poor spy like Siddhār-

thaka should faithfully hand over the signet ring of Rākṣasa to his master Cānakya without being tempted to melt it for himself,[84] that Rākṣasa, so cruel in devising various means to get Candragupta murdered, should be touched to the quick by the sad plight of Virādhagupta,[85] that he again should show high appreciation of the worth of his very rival,[86] that even Cānakya, hard-hearted and devoid of any emotion as he is, should insist on his accepting the ministership of Candragupta, and should relinquish it in his favour,[87] or that Rākṣasa should desire that Malayaketu should be released in view of their past friendship inspite of his misconduct[88] Instances like these which can be easily multiplied by a perusal of the play, should be enough to brush aside any misconception about the moral level of the society of the day of the MR And the impression gathered by these and such other instances is greatly heightened when we take into consideration the virtues displayed by Candanadāsa, his wife and son, Viṣnudāsa and Śakatadāsa About the use of questionable means in the sphere of politics and the standard of morality revealed thereby it must be stated that even the twentieth century civilization with all its boastfulness can't afford to look down upon the ancient civilization with contempt Can we not find a series of instances equally (at least, if not more) objectionable in the pages of the history of modern times? What century and what land can boast (with truth) of its politics being thoroughly above such blemishes? Power-politics is sure to abound in such and even more blameworthy actions and events irrespective of the civilization and moral standard of the society as a whole, at least so long as politicians are politicians first and human beings afterwards

NOTES

1 cf राक्षस –विष्णुगुप्त, न मा चाण्डालस्पर्शदूषित स्प्रष्टुमर्हसि ।

चाणक्य –भो अमात्यराक्षस, नेमौ चाण्डालौ । अय खलु दृष्ट एव भवता सिद्धार्थको नाम राजपुरुष । योऽप्यसौ द्वितीय सोऽपि समिद्धार्थको नाम राजपुरुष एव । pp 186 & 188

2 The honorific titles तत्रभवत् and भगवत् are applied to the ब्राह्मणs by both the नटी as well as the सूत्रधार See p 4.

3 It may be noted that भवभूति and भट्टनारायण, who were ब्राह्मण by caste, have no विदूषक in their plays

4 cf B C Law Volume, Part I, p 51 n Also see Pandit, The Signet Ring, p 183 f

5 cf Dhruva, Intr p xxi, n 9

6 cf. Dhruva, Intr p vii and n 3

7 e g Prof Taranath and M. R Kale Prof. S Ray also adopts this reading but identifies the king with चन्द्रगुप्त II of the गुप्त dynasty K T Telang adopts this reading in the text, but seems to be inclined in his introduction to favour the reading अवन्तिवर्मा.

8 e. g Dhruva, Jacobi, Macdonell and Rapson.

9 cf Dhruva, Intr p viii

80 cf Indian Antiquary, XL, pp. 265 ff.

11 cf The Journal of The Mythic Society, 1923, pp 616 f.

12 cf For these see Dhruva, Intr p vii.

13 cf. Keith, p 204 and n 1

14 cf I 20 with the preceding remark of चाणक्य

15 cf. Dhruva, Intr., n. 32

19 cf बुद्धानामपि चेष्टित सुचरितै. क्लिष्ट विशुद्धात्मना ।

* The page–referances are to Prof. Deodhar and Bedekar edition of the मुद्रा-राक्षस

17 cf. म्लेच्छैरुद्विज्यमाना भुजयुगमधुना संश्रिता राजमूर्तेः ।

18 cf. Krishn , p 606, n 8

19 cf Telang, Intr p 21 f

20 Śiśupālavadha I 47 is adduced as parallel to मु० रा० vii 21

21 The prologue, the scene between राक्षस and मलयकेतु in Act V, the scene at the place of execution easily remind us of the prologue, the trial scene, and the scene at the place of execution in the मृच्छकटिक It may be interesting to pursue this topic in fuller details

22 Bibliothica Indica (Hall) 1865, p 62. But the NSP edition adopts the other reading.

23 See Krishn , para 632

24 See Krishn , para 632 For an account of several of these, Read Dr Raghavan, मुद्राराक्षसकथा, Intr pp 51 ff

25 cf तत् त्रिविष्टपमाख्यात तन्वङ्ग्या यद् वलित्रयम् ।
येनानिमेषदृष्टित्व नृणामप्युपजायते ।। No 1548
सेन्द्रचापैः श्रिता मेघैर्निपतन्निर्झरा नगा ।
वर्णकम्बलसवीता बभुर्मत्तद्विपा इव ।। 1728

26 I 46 5 and I 3 5

27 cf तत्र बृहत्कथामूल मुद्राराक्षसम्—
चाणक्यनाम्ना तेनाथ शकटालगृहे रह ।
कृत्या विधाय सहसा सपुत्रो निहतो नृपः ।।
योगानन्दे यशःशेषे पूर्वनन्दसुतस्तत ।
चन्द्रगुप्त कृतो राजा चाणक्येन महौजसा ।।
इति बृहत्कथाया सूचितम् । p 34

It may be noted here that these stanzas actually occur in the बृहत्कथामञ्जरी of क्षेमेन्द्र who, is admittedly later than धनिक, the author of the दशरूपावलोक.

28 cf. Dhruva, Intr. p. xix f , and Haas, Intr. to दशरूपक, p xxiii

29 cf. B C. Law Volume, Part I, p. 50, n 2

30 op. cit., p. 51

31 For an analysis of the metres in the मु० रा० see Dhruva, pp 117 f.

32 cf. तन् किं कुकविकृतनाटकस्येवान्यन्मुखेऽन्यन्निर्वहणे । p. 156.

33 cf कार्योपक्षेपमादौ तनुमपि रचयंस्तस्य विस्तारमिच्छन्

बीजानां गर्भितानां फलमतिगहनं गूढमुद्भेदयंश्च ।
कुर्वन् बुध्या विमर्शं प्रसृतमपि पुनः संहरन् कार्यजातं
कर्ता वा नाटकानामिममनुभवति क्लेशमस्मद्विधो वा ॥

34 cf न केवलमहं सर्पजीवी प्राकृतकविः खल्वहम् । p 46.

35 cf अन्तःकोप (p. 10), महोत्थायिन प्रधानपुरुषा (p 10), सचिवायत्तसिद्धि (p 80), लेख्यपत्र (p. 84), अपराग (p. 86), प्रतिविधान, निग्रह, अनुग्रह (p 88), अरिमित्रोदासीनव्यवस्था (p. 132), गुल्मस्थान (p. 132),

36 p. 12.

37 cf. आर्ये, कृतश्रमोऽस्मि चतुःषष्टयङ्गे ज्योतिःशास्त्रे । तत् प्रवर्त्यतां भगवतो ब्राह्मणानुद्दिश्य पाकः । चन्द्रोपरागं प्रति तु केनापि विप्रलब्धासि । पश्य—

क्रूरग्रहः सकेतुश्चन्द्रं सम्पूर्णमण्डलमिदानीम् ।
अभिभवितुमिच्छति बलात्
रक्षत्येनं तु बुधयोगः ॥ p 4

38 cf. चतुःषष्ट्यङ्गे ज्योतिःशास्त्रे परं प्रावीण्यमुपगतः । p. 12.

39 cf राक्षसः—भदन्त निरूप्यतामस्मत्प्रस्थानदिवसः ।

क्षपणकः—श्रावक, निरूपितः । आ मध्याह्नान्निर्वृत्तसमस्तकल्याणा पौर्णमासी । युष्माकमुत्तरस्या दिशो दक्षिणां दिशं प्रस्थितानां च दक्षिणं नक्षत्रम् । अपि च

अस्ताभिमुखे सूरे उदिते सम्पूर्णमण्डले चन्द्रे ।
गमनं बुधस्य लग्ने उदितास्तमिते च केतौ ॥

राक्षसः—भदन्त, तिथिरेव न शुध्यति ।

क्षपणकः—श्रावक, एकगुणा तिथिश्चतुर्गुणं नक्षत्रम् ।
चतुःषष्टिगुणं लग्नमेष ज्योतिषतन्त्रसिद्धान्तः ॥
तत् । लग्नं भवति सुलग्नं सौम्ये ग्रहे यद्यपि दुर्लग्नम् ।
वहसि दीर्घां सिद्धिं चन्द्रस्य बलेन गच्छन् ॥

p. 118.

40 cf साध्ये निश्चितमन्वयेन घटित बिभ्रत्सपक्षे स्थिति
व्यावृत्त च विपक्षतो भवति यत्तत्साधन सिद्धये ।
यत्साध्य स्वयमेव तुल्यमुभयो पक्षे विरुद्ध च यत्
तस्याङ्गीकरणेन वादिन इव स्यात् स्वामिनो निग्रह ॥ p 138

41 cf त्रिपुरविजयिन पातु वो दु खवृत्तम् । I 2.

42 cf III 21.

43 cf II 15.

44 cf. II. 4

45 cf. दुष्कालेऽपि कलावसज्जनरुचौ प्राणै· पर रक्षता
नीत येन यशस्विनातिलघुतामौशीनराय यश. ॥ VII 5

46 cf नटी —आर्य, आमन्त्रिता मया भगवन्तो ब्राह्मणा ।
सूत्रधार —कथय कस्मिन्निमित्ते ।
नटी —उपरज्यते किल भगवाश्चन्द्र इति । p 4

47. cf. इच्छाम्यायेणाभ्यनुज्ञातो देवस्य पर्वतेश्वरस्य पारलौकिक कर्तु तेन च धारितपूर्वाणि आभरणानि ब्राह्मणाना प्रतिपादयामाति । p 20.

48 विशाखदत्त seems to have good regard for the former (cf. VII. 6c), but the latter appears to have been low in general esteem as can be very well inferred from the general belief of the sight of a क्षपणक being inauspicions (cf गक्षस —कथ प्रथममेव क्षणक । अर्व.भत्मदर्शन कारयित्वा प्रवेशयैनम् । p. 116)

49 cf सेवेय मम चित्रकर्मरचना भित्ति विना वर्तते ।

50 see B. C Law Volume, part I, p 56, n 2

51 राजशेखर in his काव्यमीमासा quotes a stanza which appears to refer to this incident cf

दत्वा रुद्धगति खराधिपतये देवी ध्रुवस्वामिनी
यस्मात् खण्डितसाहसो निववृते श्रीशर्मगुप्तो नृप ।
तस्मिन्नेव हिमालये गुरुगुहाकोणक्वणत्किन्नरे
गीयन्ते तव कार्तिकेयनगरस्त्रीणा गणै कीर्तय ॥ p 47

For details read Mujmudar and Altekar, A new History of the Indian people, Vol VI, pp 161–165

52 see B C Law volume, part I, p 57

53 cf Dhruva, Intro p. xii

54 Nos. 1548 ann 1728

CHAPTER III

1 cf आशीर्वचनसंयुक्ता स्तुतिर्यस्मात् प्रयुज्यते ।
देवद्विजनृपादीना तस्मान्नान्दीति संज्ञिता ॥
मङ्गल्यशङ्खचन्द्राब्जकोककैरवशंसिनी ।
पदैर्युक्ता द्वादशभिरष्टाभिर्वा पदैरुत ॥ सा० द० VI 24 f.

2 cf. नटी विदूषको वापि पारिपार्श्वक एव वा ॥
सूत्रधारेण सहिता संलाप यत्र कुर्वते ।
चित्रैर्वाक्यैः स्वकार्योत्थैः प्रस्तुताक्षेपिभिर्मिथः ।
आमुख तत्तु विज्ञेय नाम्ना प्रस्तावनापि सा ॥ सा० द० VI 31 f.

3 cf क्रूरग्रह सकेतुश्चन्द्र सम्पूर्णमण्डलमिदानीम् ।
अभिभवितुमिच्छति बलात् रक्षत्येन तु बुधयोग ॥ I 6

4 cf उद्घात्यक कथोद्घात प्रयोगातिशयस्तथा ।
प्रवर्तकावलगिते पञ्च प्रस्तावनाभिद ॥ सा० द० VI 33.

5 cf यदि प्रयोग एकस्मिन् प्रयोगोऽन्य प्रयुज्यते ।
तेन पात्रप्रवेशश्चेत् प्रयोगातिशयस्तदा ॥ सा० द० VI 36

6 cf धनञ्जय defines कथोद्घात as follows —
स्वेतिवृत्तसम वाक्यमर्थ वा यत्र सूत्रिण ।
गृहीत्वा प्रविशेत् पात्र कथोद्घातो द्विधैव स ॥ द० रू० III 9

According to this view the प्रस्तावना of our play would be कथोद्घात based on वाक्य

7 These are defined as follows —

काल प्रवृत्तमाश्रित्य सूत्रधृग्यत्र वर्णयेत् ।
तदाश्रयश्च पात्रस्य प्रवेशस्तत्प्रवर्तकम् ॥
यत्रैकत्र समावेशात् कार्यमन्यत् प्रसाध्यते ।
प्रयोगे खलु तज्ज्ञेय नाम्नावलगित बुधै ॥ सा० द० VI 37 f.

8 Read . पदानि त्वगतार्थानि तदर्थगतये नरा ।
योजयन्ति पदैरन्यै स उद्घात्यक उच्यते ॥
यथा मुद्राराक्षसे सूत्रधार —
क्रूरग्रह सकेतुश्चन्द्र सम्पूर्णमण्डलमिदानीम् ।
अभिभवितुमिच्छति बलात्

इत्यनन्तरम् — (नेपथ्ये) आ क एष मयि जीवति चन्द्रगुप्तमाभिभवितुमिच्छति इति अत्र अन्यार्थवन्त्यपि पदानि हृदिस्थार्थमत्या अर्थान्तरे संक्रमय्य पात्रप्रवेश । सा० द० VI 34 and वृत्ति Thereon.

9 गुणवत्युपायनिलये स्थितिहेतो साधिके त्रिवर्गस्य ।
मद्भवननीतिविद्ये कार्यादार्ये द्रुतमुपेहि ॥

10 क्रूरग्रह सकेतुश्चन्द्र सम्पूर्णमण्डलमिदानीम् ।
अभिभवितुमिच्छति बलाद् रक्षत्येन तु बुधयोग ॥

11 This is shown by the fact That निपुणक in Act I describes जीवसिद्धि as one of the three persons in the capital, who were चन्द्रगुप्तादपरक्त, in the words प्रथम तावदार्यस्य रिपुपक्षे बद्धपक्षपात क्षपणक । P 16

12 कायस्थ इति लघ्वी मात्रा । तथापि न युक्त प्राकृतमपि रिपुमवज्ञातुम् । तस्मिन्मया सुहृच्छद्मना सिद्धार्थको विनिक्षिप्त । P 18

13 ननु वक्तव्य राक्षस एवास्मदङ्गुलिप्रणयी संवृत्त इति । P 18

14 भद्र श्रुतम् । अपसर । नचिरादस्य परिश्रमस्यानुरूप फलमधिगमिष्यसि। (P 20) Also read the remark reported to have been passed by चाणक्य regarding the undue diligence or haste shown by दारुवर्मन् in Act II 'अचिरादस्य दाक्ष्यस्यानुरूप फलमधिगमिष्यसि दारुवर्मन् । ' P 50

15 अथवा न लिखामि । पूर्वमनभिव्यक्तमेवास्ताम् । P 22

16 cf. वत्स, श्रोत्रियाक्षराणि प्रयत्नलिखितान्यपि नियतमस्फुटानि भवन्ति । तदुच्यतामस्मद्वचनात् सिद्धार्थक etc P. *22*

17 cf. चाणक्य — (चिन्ता नाटयति । आत्मगतम्) अपि नाम दुरात्मा राक्षसो गृह्येत ।

सिद्धार्थक — आर्य गृहीत

चाणक्य — (सहर्षमात्मगतम्) हन्त, गृहीतो राक्षसः । (प्रकाशम्) भद्र कोऽय गृहीत ।

सिद्धार्थक — गृहीत आर्यसन्देश । तद् गमिष्यामि कार्यसिद्ध्यै ।

चाणक्य — (साङ्गुलिमुद्र लेखमर्पयित्वा) गम्यताम् । अस्तु ते कार्यसिद्धिः । p.24

18 भो श्रेष्ठिन्, एवमय राजापथ्यकारिषु तीक्ष्णदण्डो न मर्षयिष्यति राक्षसकलत्रप्रच्छादन भवत । तद्रक्ष परकलत्रेणात्मन कलत्र जीवित च । p 32

19 आर्य किं मे भयं दर्शयसि । सन्तमपि गेहे अमात्यराक्षसस्य गृहजन न समर्पयामि कि पुनरसन्तम् । p. 32

20 चाणक्य.—(सहर्षम्) हन्त, लब्ध इदानीं राक्षस । कुत
त्यजन्त्यप्रियवत् प्राणान् यथा तस्यायमापदि ।
तथैवास्यापदि प्राणा नून तस्यापि न प्रिया ॥ p. 34.

21 cf (आत्मगतम्) दुरात्मन् राक्षस, क्वेदानीं गमिष्यसि । एषोऽहमचिराद्भवन्तम्—

स्वच्छन्दमेकचरमुज्ज्वलदानशक्ति—
मुत्सेकिना मदबलेन विगाहमानम् ।
बुध्द्या निगृह्य वृषलस्य कृते क्रियाया—
मारण्यक गजमिव प्रगुणीकरोमि ॥ p 36

22 cf II 6 and 7

23 cf तदहमाश्रयोन्मूलनेनैव त्वामकाना करोमि । p 42

24 cf प्रतिक्षणमरातिवृत्तान्तोपलब्धये तत्संहतिभेदनाय च व्यापारिता सुहृदा जावसिद्धिप्रभृतय । p 42

25 cf तस्यैव बुद्धिविशिखेन भिनद्मि मर्म
वर्मीभवेद्यदि न दैवमदृश्यमानम् ॥ II 8 cd

26 cf साधु अमात्यराक्षस, साधु । साधु श्रोत्रिय, साधु । साधु मन्त्रिबृहस्पते साधु । कुत —

ऐश्वर्यादनपेतमीश्वरमय लोकोऽर्थत सेवते
त गच्छन्त्यनु ये विपत्तिषु पुनस्ते तत्प्रतिष्ठाशया ।
भर्तुर्ये प्रलयेऽपि पूर्वसुकृतासङ्गेन नि सङ्गया
भक्त्या कार्यधुर वहन्ति बहवस्ते दुर्लभास्त्वादृशा ॥ et seq p 10.

27 cf न न कौतूहल सर्पेषु । p 44

28 प्रियवदक, प्रवेशयैन सुकविरेष । श्रोतव्यमस्मात्सुभाषितम् । p 46

29 प्रियवदक भुजङ्गैरिदानीं विनोदयितव्यम् । तद्विश्रम्यतामितः परिजनेन । त्वमपि स्वाधिकारमशून्य कुरु । p 46

30 cf कार्यव्यग्रत्वान्मनस प्रभूतत्वाच्च प्रणिधीना विस्मृतम् । इदानीं स्मृतिरुपलब्धा । (p. 46) Also cf. कस्मिन्प्रयोजने मयाय प्रहित इति प्रयोजाना बाहुल्यान्न खल्ववधारयामि । p. 100.

31 cf अये विराध—(इत्यर्धोक्ते) ननु विरूढश्मश्रु p. 46

32 cf (शस्त्रमाकृष्य ससम्भ्रमम्) आ मयि स्थिते क. कुसुमपुरमुपरोत्स्यति । प्रवीरक प्रवीरक क्षिप्रमिदानीम् —et seq p 48.

33 cf (निश्वस्य) कष्ट वृत्तमिदम्। मया पुनर्ज्ञात स एवाय काल इति। (शस्त्रमुत्सृज्य) हा देव नन्द स्मरामि ते राक्षस प्रति प्रसादातिशयम्। et seq p 48.

34 cf II 15

35 cf (सोद्वेगम्) सखे, कुतश्चाणक्यबटो परितोष । अफलमनिष्टफल वा दारुवर्मण प्रयत्नमवगच्छासि। p. 52

36 cf नियतमतिधूर्तेन चाणक्यबटुना तस्यापि तपस्विन क्रमायुपांशुवधमाकलय्य पर्वतेश्वरविनाशेन जनितमयश प्रमार्ष्टुमेषा लोकप्रसिद्धिरुपन्चिता। p 52

37 cf कथमत्रापि दैवेनोपहता वयम्। p 56. Also read —

(सास्रम्) कष्ट भो कष्टम्। सखे पश्य दैवसम्पद दुरात्मनश्चन्द्रगुप्तहतकस्य। कुत et seq p 56

38 cf (स्वगतम्) साधु कौटिल्य साधु।

परिहृतमयश पातितमस्मासु च घातितोऽर्धराज्यहर ।
एकमपि नीतिबीज बहुफलतामेति यस्य तव ॥ p 58

39 cf अथवा स्वाम्यर्थमुपरतो न शोच्यस्त्वम्। वयमेवात्र शोच्या ये नन्दकुलविनाशेऽपि जीवितुमिच्छाम। P. 58

40 cf तत् कि परितुष्ट कथयसि अपवाहित राक्षसकलत्रमिति। ननु वक्तव्य सयमित सपुत्रकलत्रो राक्षस इति। P 60

41 cf. तस्माच्च सुहृत्प्राणपरिरक्षणपरितुष्टात् पारितोषिक ग्राह्यम्। राक्षस एव कञ्चित्काल सेवितव्य। (p. 24,) also read (स्वगतम्) अय स्वल्वार्योपदेश। भवतु। तथा करिष्यामि। (p 62,) and जानात्येवामात्यो यथा चाणक्यबटुकस्य विप्रिय कृत्वा नास्ति पुन पाटलिपुत्रे प्रवेश इति इच्छाम्यहममात्यचरणावेव शुश्रूषितुम्। P 64

42 cf 'आर्य तातेन धृतपूर्वाणा विशेषतश्चन्द्रगुप्तहस्तगताना वणिग्विक्रय इति न युज्यते। अथवा युज्यत एवैतत्। कुत —

चन्द्रगुप्तस्य विक्रेतुरधिक लाभमिच्छत, ।
कल्पिता मूल्यमेतेषा क्रूरेण भवता वयम् ॥ P. 148

43 cf. राज्यप्राप्तिकृतार्थमेकमपर तीर्णप्रतिज्ञार्णव
सौहार्दात् कृतकृत्यतैव नियत लब्धान्तरा भेत्स्यति ॥ II. 23 cd.

44 विश्वनाथ defines गर्भाङ्क as follows —

अङ्कोदरप्रविष्टो यो रङ्गद्वारामुखादिमान्।
अङ्कोऽपर स गर्भाङ्क सबीज फलवानपि ॥ सा. द. VI. 20.

In his प्रियदर्शिका Act III श्रीहर्ष has made the maids of वासवदत्ता enact before her a play representing her early adventures with वत्स. We have two more instances of गर्भाङ्क, one in भवभूति's उत्तररामचरित act VII and the other in राजशेखर's बालरामायण Act III.

45 This is defined as—

किं ब्रवीष्येवमित्यादि विना पात्रं ब्रवीति यत् ।
श्रुत्वेवानुक्तमप्येकस्तत् स्यादाकाशभाषितम् ॥ द. रू. I. 67.

46 cf. (स्वगतम्) राज्यं हि नाम राजधर्मानुवृत्तिपरस्य नृपतेर्महदप्रीतिस्थानम् । et seq. P. 70

47 cf. दुराराध्या हि राजलक्ष्मीरात्मवद्भिरपि राजभिः । कुतः । et seq. P. 70.

48 cf. अन्यच्च । कृतककलहं कृत्वा स्वतन्त्रेण त्वया किंचित्कालान्तरं व्यवहर्तव्यमित्यार्यादेशः । स च मया कथमपि पातकमिवाभ्युपगतः । P. 70.

49 cf. III. 6

50 cf. III. 7–9

51 cf. III. 15

52 cf. न शक्नुमो वयमार्यस्य वाचा वाचमतिशयितुम् । P. 90.

53 cf. सर्वथा अमात्यराक्षस एवात्र प्रशस्यतरः । and also III. 26.

54 cf. (विहस्य) एतत् कृतं राक्षसेन । मया पुनर्ज्ञातं नन्दमिव भवन्तमुद्धृत्य भवानिव भूतले मलयकेतू राजाधिराजपदे नियोजित इति । P. 92.

55 cf. अन्येनैवेदमनुष्ठितम् । किमत्रार्यस्य । and नन्दकुलविद्वेषिणा दैवेन । P. 92.

56 cf. विद्वांसोऽप्यविकत्थना भवन्ति ।

57 cf. अनेन शुष्ककलहेन शिरोवेदना मां बाधते । P. 96.

58 cf. राक्षस राक्षस एष भवतः कौटिल्यबुद्धिविजिगीषोर्बुद्धेः प्रकर्षः ।
चाणक्यतश्चलितभक्तिमहं सुखेन
जेष्यामि मौर्यमिति सम्प्रति यः प्रयुक्तः ।
भेदः किलैष भवता सकलः स एव
सम्पत्स्यते शठ तवैव हि दूषणाय ॥ P. 94.

59 आर्याज्ञयैव मम लङ्घितगौरवस्य
बुद्धिः प्रवेष्टुमिव भूविवरं प्रवृत्ता !
ये सत्यमेव हि गुरूनतिपातयन्ति
तेषां कथं नु हृदयं न भिनत्ति लज्जा ॥ III. 33.

60 cf. भद्र शनैर्मन्त्रय । एषोऽमात्य कार्यचिन्ताजनितेन जागरेण समुत्पन्नशीर्षवेदनोऽद्यापि शयन न मुञ्चति । P. 98

61. cf आर्या एष खलु कुमारो मलयकेतु समुत्पन्नशीर्षवेदनममात्यराक्षस प्रेक्षितुमित एवागच्छति । P. 120

62 cf (आकर्ण्य) सखे भागुरायण, कुसुमपुरवृत्तान्त प्रस्तूयते । न तत्र तावदुपसर्पाम । शृणुमस्तावत् । p 106 It must, however, be noted that मलयकेतु has offered a plausible ground for what he has proposed to do. cf. कुत । सत्त्वभङ्गभयाद्राज्ञ कथयन्त्यन्यथा पुर ।
अन्यथा विवृताचपु स्वैरालापेषु मन्त्रिण ॥ IV 8

63 cf मलयकेतु —सखे भागुरायण, विज्ञप्तोऽहमिहागच्छद्भिर्भद्रभटप्रभृतिभि यथा न वयममात्यराक्षसद्वारेण कुमारमाश्रयणीयमाश्रयामहे । किन्तु कुमारस्य सेनापति शिखरकमुरीकृत्य दुष्टामात्यपरिगृहीताच्चन्द्रगुप्तादपरक्ता कुमारमाभिरामिकगुणयोगादाश्रयणीयमाश्रयामह इति । तत्र मया सुचिरमपि विचारयता तेपामय वाक्यार्थोऽवधारित ।

भागुरायण —कुमार न दुर्बोधोऽयमर्थ. । विजिगीषुमात्मगुणसम्पन्न प्रियहितद्वारेणाश्रयणीयमाश्रयेदिति तु न्याय्य एवायमर्थ ।

मलयकेतु —सखे भागुरायण, नन्वमात्यराक्षसोऽस्माक प्रियतमो हिततमश्च ।

भागुरायण —एवमेतत् । किन्त्वमात्यराक्षसश्चाणक्ये बद्धवैरो न चन्द्रगुप्ते । तद्यदि कदाचिच्चाणक्यमतिजितकाशिनमसहमान स साचिव्यादपरोपयेत्ततो नन्दकुलभक्त्या नन्दान्वय एवायमिति सुहृज्जनापेक्षया चामात्यराक्षसश्चन्द्रगुप्तेन सह सदधीत । चन्द्रगुप्तोऽपि पितृपर्यायागत एवायमिति सन्धिमनुमन्येत । एव सत्यस्मासु कुमारो न विश्वसेदित्ययमेपा वाक्यार्थ ।

मलयकेतु —युज्यते । अमात्यस्य गृहमादेशय । p. 104.

64 (आत्मगतम्) कस्मिन् प्रयोजने मयाय प्रहित इति प्रयोजनाना बाहुल्यान्न खल्ववधारयामि । (इति चिन्ता नाटयति) p 100

65 cf शकटदास, एवमेतत् । गच्छ विश्रामय करभकम् ।
शकटदास —तथा । (इति पुरुषेण सह निष्क्रान्त) p 110.

66 cf शकटदास नेदमुपपद्यते । पश्य । et seq p 110

67 cf अलमन्यथा विकल्प्य । उपपद्यत एवैतत् । पश्यन्त्वमात्य । et seq p. 110.

68 cf It may perhaps be argued that the presence of a dear friend like शकटदास is not unnatural in view of the fact that राक्षस is suffering from headache

69 cf. दिष्ट्या न सचिवायत्ततन्त्रोऽस्मि । p 114

70 cf. ऐकान्तिकमेव कार्यसिद्धिमवगन्तुमर्हति कुमार । कुत । et seq. p 114.

71 cf. IV 16–17.

72 In fact it is मलयकेतु alone who is shown to enter into the presence of राक्षस, with the remark 'अहमेवार्यं द्रष्टुमागत ।' (p 110) Nothing is here said about भागुरायण This may be interpreted to mean that भागुरायण did not accompany मलयकेतु into राक्षस's presence The same is shown again by the stage direction 'यथार्हमुपविष्टौ' the dual wherein shows that besides राक्षस and मलयकेतु there was none else there. After IV 17, however, we get the stage-direction 'इति भागुरायणेन सह निष्क्रान्तो मलयकेतु ' (p. 116) which would mean that भागुरायण was present on the stage while मलयकेतु was engaged in conversation with राक्षस

73. cf. प्रायो भृत्यास्त्यजन्ति प्रचलितविभव स्वामिन सेवमाना । IV 21 d.

74 cf. सर्वथा शिवा पन्थान सन्तु । (p 34), Also read तत्तत्कारणमुत्पाद्य कृतकृत्यतामापादिताश्चन्द्रगुप्तसहोत्थायिनो भद्रभटप्रभृतय. प्रधानपुरुषा । p 10 f

75. e g The letter which चाणक्य got written by शकटदास, the अलङ्कारs wich चाणक्य secured through विश्वावसु and his brothers from चन्द्रगुप्त, the ornaments sent to राक्षस by मलयकेतु etc etc.

76 Ultimately perhaps the root of राक्षस's defeat may be said to lie in a trait in his own character viz full faith or absence of suspicion or cautiousness as it may be described negatively. It is obvious that this trait in his character is responsible for several blunders committed by him.

77 For definitions of प्रवेशक and विष्कम्भक read —

वृत्तवर्तिष्यमाणाना कथाशाना निदर्शक ।
सक्षेपार्थस्तु विष्कम्भो मध्यपात्रप्रयोजित ॥

एकानेककृत शुद्ध सकीर्णो नीचमध्यमै ।
तद्वदेवानुदात्तोक्त्या नीचपात्रप्रयोजित ।
प्रवेशोऽङ्कद्वयस्यान्त· शेषार्थस्योपसूचक ॥ द० रू० I 59 ff

78 This मुद्रा of भागुरायण is no less important from the dramatic point of view. It is owing to its absence that सिद्धार्थक is captivated and brought before भागुरायण who questions him in the presence of मलयकेतु. It is here in fact that we evince a beginning of the fall of राक्षस

79 This situation, so far as stage arrangement is concerned, is similar to the one in the bifocal scene in Act IV Even here मलयकेतु's mind is adversely affected by the information that he gathers by overhearing the conversation between भागुरायण and क्षपणक

80 cf कष्टमेवमस्मासु स्नेहवान् कुमारो मलयकेतुरतिसन्धातव्य इत्यहो दुष्करम्। अथवा et seq P. 126

81 cf (स्वगतम्) अहो राक्षस प्रति विकल्पबाहुल्यादाकुला मे बुद्धिर्न निश्चयमधिगच्छति कुत et seq P 126 f

It may be observed here that मलयकेतु's mind has been very well prejudiced against राक्षस in Act IV, but yet (this remark of मलयकेतु shows) the poisoning is not complete. This is what is accomplished by the bifocal scene here

82 cf क्षपणक —का गति । शृणोतु श्रावक । अस्ति तावदह मन्दभाग्य प्रथम पाटलिपुत्रे निवसन् राक्षसेन मित्रत्वमुपगत । तस्मिन्नवसरे राक्षसेन गूढविषकन्याप्रयोगमुत्पाद्य घातितो देव पर्वतेश्वर ।

मलयकेतु —(सबाष्पमात्मगतम्) कथ राक्षसेन घातितो न चाणक्येन ।

भागुरायण —भदन्त ततस्तत ।

क्षपणक —ततोऽह राक्षसमित्रमिति कृत्वा चाणक्यहतकेन सनिकार नगरान्निर्वासित । इदानीमपि राक्षसेनानेककार्यकुशलेन किमपि तादृशमारभ्यते येनाह जीवलोकान्निष्कासिष्ये ।

भागुरायण.—भदन्त, प्रतिश्रुतार्धमनिच्छता चाणक्यहतकेनेदमकार्यमनुष्ठित न राक्षसेनेति श्रुतमस्माभि ।

क्षपणक —शान्त पापम् । चाणक्येन विषकन्याया नामापि न श्रुतम् । P. 130

83 cf भदन्त, इय मुद्रा दीयते । एहि कुमार श्रावय । P 130

84 cf अये, श्रुत मलयकेतुहतकेन । हन्त कृतार्थोऽस्मि । P 130

85 cf सखे भागुरायण, लेखमपनय । and मुद्रा परिपालयन्नुद्घाट्य दर्शय । P 134

86 cf सखे अय लेखस्तावदन्यार्यो भविष्यति । इमामपि मुद्रां परिपालयन्नुद्घाट्य दर्शय । P 136

87 cf (विलोक्य) अये तदिदमाभरण मया स्वशरीरादवतार्य राक्षसाय प्रेषितम् । इत्युक्त चन्द्रगुप्तस्य लेख । P 136

88 cf (स्वगतम्) कथ चित्रवर्माद्योऽपि नामाभिद्रुह्यन्ति । अथवा अत एव तेषा राक्षसे निरतिशया प्रीति । P 138

89 cf (आत्मगतम्) आपूर्णमस्मद्बल चन्द्रगुप्तबलैरिति यत्सत्य न मे मनस परिशुद्धिरस्ति । कुत —

> साध्ये निश्चितमन्वयेन घटित बिभ्रत् सपक्षे स्थिति
> व्यावृत्त च सपक्षतो भवति यत् तत् साधन सिद्धये ।
> यत् साध्य स्वयमेव तुल्यमुभयो पक्षे विरुद्ध च यत्
> तस्याङ्गीकरणेन वादिन इव स्यात् स्वामिनो निग्रह ॥

अथवा विज्ञातापरागहेतुभि प्राक्परिगृहीतोपजापैरापूर्णमिति न विकल्पयितुमर्हामि । P 138

90 cf परिधापिता कुमारेणाभरणानि वयम् । तन्न युक्तमनलङ्कृते. कुमारदर्शनमनुभवितुम् । अतो यत्तदलङ्करणत्रय क्रीत तन्मध्यादेक दीयतामिति । P. 140

91 cf. (आत्मगतम्) अविकारपद नाम निर्दोषस्यापि पुरुषस्य महदाशङ्कास्थानम् । कुत et seq. P 140

92 cf. V 13

93 cf (स्वगतम्) कथ य एव मद्विनाशेन चन्द्रगुप्तमाराधयितुमुद्यतास्त एव मा परित्रायन्ति । P. 142

94 cf. राक्षस —अवसितमिदानी गतागतप्रयोजनम् । अल्पैरेवाहोभिर्वयमेव तत्र गन्तार ।

मलयकेतु —(स्वगतम्) विज्ञायते । p 142

95 cf (स्वगतम्) अहो सुश्लिष्टोऽभूच्छत्रुप्रयोग. । कुत ।

> लेखोऽय न ममेति नोत्तरमिद मुद्रा मदीया यतः
> सौहार्द शकटेन खण्डितमिति श्रद्धेयमेतत् कथम् ।

मौर्ये भूषणविक्रय नरपतौ को नाम सम्भावयेत्
तस्मात् सम्प्रतिपत्तिरेव हि वरं न ग्राम्यमन्त्रोत्तरम् ॥ p 148

96 cf कुमार य आर्यस्त पृच्छ । वयमिदानीमनार्या सवृत्ता । p 148

97 cf राक्षस —कुमार, एवमयुक्तव्याहारिणा निर्णयो दत्त । भवतु तव को दोष । p 148

98 cf मलयकेतु —(लेखमलङ्करणस्थगिका च निर्दिश्य) इदमिदानीं किम्।
राक्षस —(सबाष्पम्) विविविलसितम् । et seq. p 150

99 cf (सरोषम्) किमद्यापि निह्नूयत एव । विधे किलैतव्यवसित न लोभस्य । अनार्य et seq p 150

100 cf राक्षस —नाह पर्वतेश्वरे विषकन्या प्रयुक्तवान् ।
मलयकेतु —केन तर्हि व्यापादितस्तात ।
राक्षस —दैवमत्र प्रष्टव्यम् ।
मलयकेतु —(सरोषम्) दैवमत्र प्रष्टव्यम् । न क्षपणको जीवसिद्धि ।
राक्षस —(स्वगतम्) कथ जीवसिद्धिरपि चाणक्यप्रणिधि. । हन्त रिपुभिर्मे हृदयमपि स्वीकृतम् । p 150

101 cf राक्षस राक्षस नाह विश्रम्भघाती राक्षस । मलयकेतु खल्वहम् । तद् गच्छ समाश्रीयता सर्वात्मना चन्द्रगुप्त । p 152

102 cf (सावेगम्) हा धिक् कष्टम् । तेऽपि घातिताश्चित्रवर्मादयस्तपस्विन तत्कथ सुहृद्विनाशाय राक्षसश्चेष्टते न रिपुविनाशाय । तत् किमिदानीं मन्दभाग्य करवाणि।

कि गच्छामि तपोवन न तपसा शाम्येत् सवैर मन
कि भर्तॄननुयामि जीवति रिपौ स्त्रीणामिय योग्यता ।
किवा खड्गसख पताम्यरिबले नैतच्च युक्त भवे—
च्चेतश्चन्दनदासमोक्षरभस रुन्ध्यात्कृतघ्न न चेत् ॥ v. 25

103 वयस्य भद्रभटप्रमुखा. किल देवाच्चन्द्रगुप्तादपरक्ता मलयकेतु समाश्रिता इति लोके मन्यते । तत् कि कुकविकृतनाटकस्येवान्यन्मुखेऽन्यान्निर्वहणे ।

सिद्धार्थक —वयस्य दैवगत्या इवाश्रुतगत्यै नाम आर्यचाणक्यनीत्यै । p 156

Also read —अतिमुग्धोऽसीदानीं त्व यतोऽमात्यराक्षसेनाप्यनवगाहितपूर्वमार्य-चाणक्यस्य चरितमवगाहितुमिच्छसि । p. 158

104 cf तदिदानीमपि तावदरातिहस्तगतो विनश्येन्न तु राक्षसश्चन्द्रगुप्तेन सह सदधीत । p. 164

105 cf अथवा मम काममसत्यसन्ध इति वरमयशो न तु शत्रुवञ्चनपराभूत इति। p 164

106 cf अत्र प्रविश्य कुतश्चिच्चन्दनदासप्रवृत्तिमुपलप्स्ये। p. 164

107 cf पुरुष —अथ पुन केनोपायेन त्व चन्दनदास मरणान्मोचयसि।
राक्षस —(खड्गमाकृष्य) नन्वनेन व्यवसायसुहृदा निस्त्रिंशेन। p 172f.

108 cf आश्चर्य दिष्ट्या दृष्टोऽसि। प्रसीदन्त्वमात्यपादा । et seq. p 174

109 cf VI 21

110 cf अय मित्रकार्येण मे विनाशो, न पुरुषदोषेण। (p 180), जात अवश्यम्भवितव्ये विनाशे मित्रकार्य समुद्वहमानो विनाशमनुभवामि। p 182

111 cf अथवा न नृशसानामुदासीनेषु इतरेषु वा विशेषोऽस्ति। तथा हि et seq. p. 180.*

112 cf अथवा दुर्लभास्ते मानुषा य एतस्मिन्काले दृष्टिपथेऽपि तिष्ठन्ति। p 180

113 cf स्वर्ग गताना तावद्देवा दु खित परिजनमनुकम्पन्ते। p 182

114 cf भद्र मुहूर्त तिष्ठ यावत्पुत्रक सान्त्वयामि। p 182

115 cf तात किमिदमपि भणितव्यम्। कुलधर्म खल्वेषोऽस्माकम्। p. 182.

116 cf IV 4

117 cf. चन्दनदासः—(सबाष्प विलोक्य) अमात्य किमिदम्।
राक्षस —त्वदीयसुचरितैकदेशस्यानुकरण किलैतत्।
चन्दनदास —अमात्य, सर्वमपीम प्रयास निष्फल कुर्वता त्वया किमनुष्ठितम्।
राक्षसः—सखे, स्वार्थ एवानुष्ठित । कृतमुपालम्भेन। P 184

118 cf VI 5

119 cf चाणक्य —भद्र कथय कथय।

केनोत्तुङ्गशिखाकलापकपिलो बद्ध पटान्ते शिखी
पाशै केन सदागतेरगतिता सद्यः समासादिता।
केनानेकपदानवासितसट. सिंहोऽर्पित पञ्जरे
भीम केन च नैकनक्रमकरो दोर्भ्या प्रतीर्णोऽर्णव ।

चाण्डाल —नीतिनिपुणबुद्धिनार्येण।
चाणक्य —मा मैवम्। नन्दकुलविद्वेषिणा दैवेनेति ब्रूहि। P 186.

120 cf शकटदासोऽपि तपस्वी तादृश लेखमजानन्नेव कपटलेख मया लेखित इति। P. 188

121 cf दिष्ट्या शकटदासं प्रत्यपनीतो विकल्प ।

122 cf VII 9

123 cf VII 10–11

124 cf किं बहुना । न खलु भवत शस्त्रग्रहणमन्तरेण चन्दनदासस्य जीवितमस्ति ।
राक्षस —(प्रकाशम्) विष्णुगुप्त, नम सर्वकार्यप्रतिपत्तिहेतवे सुहृत्स्नेहाय । का गतिः एष प्रह्वोऽस्मि ।

IV

1 cf I 11–13, III 27–28, etc.

2 cf. I 21 also read वयस्य, को जीवलोके जीवितुकामः आर्यचाणक्यस्याज्ञामपि प्रतिकूलयति । (P 160)

3 e g. The ornaments of पर्वतेश्वर and the मुद्रा of राक्षस.

4 This is clear from his argumentation in Act III

5 PP 28 f

6 cf I 15–16

7 cf VII. 7, II 19

8 चन्दनदास calls him चाणक्यहतक and दुष्ट (cf P 26), and also advises his son to stay in a चाणक्यविरहित देश (cf P. 182)

9 cf. III. 15.

10 cf साधु अमात्यराक्षस, साधु । साधु श्रोत्रिय, साधु । साधु मन्त्रिबृहस्पते साधु कृत et seq , also cf VII. 8 where he appreciates राक्षस Also read साधु चन्दनदास, साधु । and the stanza that follows (P. 32)

11 This is shown by the almost identical remark that he passes at what is done by his spy (P. 20) and also by दारुवर्मन् (P 50).

12 cf. I 15.

13 cf I 14 and the preceding speech of चाणक्य Also cf II. 20 and the preceding remark of राक्षस and विराधगुप्त Also read II 22.

14 cf. अये देवपादपद्मोपजीविनोऽवस्थेयम् । (इति रोदिति ।) P 48

15 cf II. 16, V. 21, VI 7, 15

16 cf P 42 f

17 cf. उच्यतां शकटदासः । यथा परिधापिताः कुमारेणाभरणानि वयम् । तन्न युक्तमनलङ्कृतैः कुमारदर्शनमनुभवितुम् । अतो यत्तदलङ्करणत्रयं क्रीतं तन्मध्यादेकं दीयतामिति । (P. 140).

18 cf. संवदन्त्यक्षराणि । शकटदासस्तु मित्रमिति च विसंवदन्त्यक्षराणि । et. seq. P. 146.

19 cf. दिष्ट्या शकटदासं प्रत्यपनीतो विकल्पः । (P. 188).

20 cf. His request that मलयकेतु's life should be saved. (P. 192).

21 cf. III. 21.

22 cf. राज्यं हि नाम राजधर्मानुवृत्तिपरस्य नृपतेर्महदप्रीतिस्थानम् । and the lowing stanza. (P. 70).

23 cf. दुराराध्या हि राजलक्ष्मीरात्मवद्भिरपि राजभिः । and the following nza. (III. 5).

24 cf. III. 7–9.

25 cf. भोः श्रेष्ठिन्, चन्द्रगुप्तराज्यमिदं न नन्दराज्यम् । यतो नन्दस्यैवार्थरुचेरर्थबन्धः प्रीतिमुत्पादयति । चन्द्रगुप्तस्य तु भवतामपरिक्लेश एव । (P. 28).

26 cf. वृषल एव केवलं प्रधानप्रकृतिरस्मास्वारोपितराज्यतन्त्रभारः सततमुदास्ते । '. 12); ततः सचिवायत्तसिद्धेस्तव किं प्रयोजनान्वेषणेन । (P. 80)

27 cf. III. 12 ; 18 ; cf. VII. 14 where राक्षस also suggestively mpares नन्द and चन्द्रगुप्त.

28 cf. अहो विवेकशून्यता म्लेच्छस्य । कुतः । and the following ınza. (VI. 8).

29 cf. His soliloquy in Act IV.(P, 102).

30 cf इमान्याभरणानि कुमारेण स्वशरीरादवतार्य प्रेषितानि धारयितुमर्हत्यार्यः । '. 44).

31 cf. VII. 14

32 cf चन्द्रगुप्तशरीरमभिद्रोग्धुमस्मत्प्रयुक्तानां तीक्ष्णरसदायिनामुपसंग्रहार्थं परोपजापार्थं च महता कोशसंचयेन स्थापितः शकटदासः । (P. 42).

33 P. 24

34 P. 146

35 cf. हन्त लब्ध इदानीं राक्षसः । कुतः ।

त्यजत्यप्रियवत् प्राणान् यथा तस्यायमापदि ।
तथैवास्यापदि प्राणा नूनं तस्यापि न प्रियाः ॥ I. 25

36 cf. तत्किं परितुष्ट कथयसि अपवाहित राक्षसकलत्रमिति । ननु वक्तव्य संयमित. सपुत्रकलत्रो राक्षस इति । (P. 60)

37 cf आर्ये, अय मित्रकार्येण मे विनाशो न पुन पुरुषदोषेण। तदल विषादेन। (P. 180), स्वर्ग गताना तावद्देवा दु खित परिजनमनुकम्पन्ते । अन्यच्च मित्रकार्येण मे विनाशो नायुक्तकार्येण । तत् कि हर्षस्थानेऽपि रुद्यते । (P.182), जात, अवश्य भवितव्ये विनाशे मित्रकार्य समुद्वहमानो विनाशमनुभवामि ।P.(182), अमात्य, सर्वमपीम प्रयास निष्फल कुर्वता त्वया किमनुष्ठितम्। (P 184)

38 cf. P 10

39 cf. अय खल्वार्योपदेश । भवतु । तथा करिष्यामि । (प्रकाशम्) अमात्य प्रथमप्रविष्टस्य नास्ति कोऽपि परिचितो यत्रेममात्यस्य प्रसाद निक्षिप्य निर्वृतो भवामि। तस्मादिच्छाम्यहमेतया मुद्रया मुद्रितममात्यस्यैव भाण्डागारे स्थापयितुम्। यदा मे प्रयोजन तदा ग्रहीष्यामि। (P 62), जानात्येवामात्यो यथा चाणक्यवटुकस्य विप्रिय कृत्वा नास्ति पुन पाटलिपुत्रे प्रवेश इतीच्छाम्यहममात्यचरणावेव शुश्रूषितुम्। (p. 64)

40 cf. V 1

41 cf वयस्य को जीवलोके जीवितुकाम आर्यचाणक्यस्याज्ञामि प्रतिकूलयति। p 160

42 cf. पिता ते चाणक्येन घातित इति रहसि त्रासयित्वा भागुरायणेनापवाहितः पर्वतकपुत्रो मलयकेतु । (P. 10)

43 P 104

44 P 128 f

45 p. 134 ff

46 p 146

47 p. 132

48 cf ईदृशमस्य विशेषत कुमारेणात्मगात्रादवतार्य प्रसादीकृतस्येय परित्याग-भूमि.। (p 144)

49 cf V 4 and the preceding remark of भागुरायण (p 126)

50 p 12

51 cf e g IV 19 and 20.

52 p. 118

53 cf. अये श्रुत मलयकेतुहतकेन । हन्त कृतार्थोऽस्मि । (p 130).

54 cf VI 4; V 1, and IV. 3

55 cf p. 180 f.

56 cf. तात किमिदमपि भणितव्यम् । कुलधर्मः खल्वेषोऽस्माकम् । (p 182)

57 cf दशरूपक ३.३०

58 cf दशरूपक २ १-२

59 cf दशरूपक २ ३, न्याट्यशास्त्र २४ ३ ff.

60 This and the next paragraphs are based on Allardyce Nicoll's 'The Theory of Drama' (1931)

61 p 10

62 Even चाणक्य, it should be noted here, calls him तपस्वी. cf p 8.

63 cf राजन् चन्द्रगुप्त, विदितमेव ते यथा वय मलयकेतौ कन्चित् कालमुषिता. । तत् परिरक्ष्यन्तामस्य प्राणा । (p 192).

64 cf अये, अयमसावमात्यराक्षस. येन महात्मना—
गुरुभि· कल्पनाक्लेशैर्दीर्घजागरहेतुभि. ।
चिरमायासिता सेना वृषलस्य मतिश्च मे ॥ VII· 8

CHAPTER V

1 According to धनञ्जय the plot of a drama may be प्रख्यात (or derived from history), उत्पाद्य (imaginary) or मिश्र (i e partly historical and partly imaginary). धुण्डिराज says that the plot of the मुद्राराक्षस is of the first variety. cf प्रख्यातोत्पाद्यमिश्रत्वभेदात् त्रेधापि तत् त्रिधा। प्रख्यातमितिहासादेरुत्पाद्य कविकल्पितम् । मिश्र च सङ्करात्ताभ्यां दिव्यमर्त्यादिभेदत ॥ दशरूपक १ १५-१६.

2 cf तस्य चाष्टौ भविष्यन्ति सुमाल्यप्रमुखा सुता. ।
य इमा भोक्ष्यन्ति मही राजान. स्म शत समा ॥
नव नन्दान् द्विज कश्चित् प्रपन्नानुद्धरिष्यति ।
स एव चन्द्रगुप्त वै द्विज राज्येऽभिषेक्ष्यति ॥
भागवत XII 1 10 f

Also cf. वायु॰ 99. 326 ff

3 The author of the दशरूपावलोक seems to have held बृहत्कथा as the source of the मुद्राराक्षस: cf तत्र बृहत्कथामूल मुद्राराक्षसम् ।

चाणक्यनाम्ना तेनाथ शकटालगृहे रह. ।
कृत्या विधाय सहसा सपुत्रो निहतो नृप· ॥
योगानन्दे यश·शेषे पूर्वनन्दसुतस्तत ।
चन्द्रगुप्त कृतो राजा चाणक्येन महौजसा ॥

इति बृहत्कथाया सूचितम् । दशरूपावलोक p. 34.

4. cf येन शस्त्रं च शास्त्र च नन्दराजगता च भू ।
अमर्षेणोद्धृतान्याशु तेन शास्त्रमिद कृतम् ॥

अर्थशास्त्र, p 431.

5 cf यस्याभिचारवज्रेण वज्रज्वलनतेजस ।
पपात मूलत श्रीमान् सुपर्वा नन्दपर्वत ॥
एकाकी मन्त्रशक्त्या य शक्त शक्तिधरोपम ।
आजहार नृचन्द्राय चन्द्रगुप्ताय मेदिनीम् ॥
नीतिशास्त्रामृत धीमानर्थशास्त्रमहोदधे. ।
य उद्दध्रे नमस्तस्मै विष्णुगुप्ताय वेधसे ॥

कामन्दक quoted by धुण्डिराज.

6 cf. भागवत XII. 1 8–15, वायु 99.326–333.

7 For the Greek versions of this story, Read Dr. Raghavan, मुद्राराक्षसकथा, Introduction, pp 78 ff

8 cf. II. 7 and VI. 6

9 For the early life of चन्द्रगुप्त based mainly on the Jain sources and copious references to the other sources, cf. B. C Low Volume, Part I pp 590–610 Also read Dr Raghavan, op. cit, pp 68 ff

10 It is curious to note that though generally विशाखदत्त refers to चन्द्रगुप्त as मौर्य, in one place (II 6) he has called him मौर्यपुत्र.

11 cf II 7 and VI 6

12 Inspite of all attempts to explain this term, it must be admitted that it was generally regarded as not being very commendable, as is clear from the कञ्चुकिन्'s remark, 'तत् स्थाने खल्वस्य वृषलोयश्चन्द्रगुप्त ।' Act III

13 cf दीर्घप्रवासिन प्रव्रजितस्य प्रेतस्य वा भार्या सप्त तीर्थान्याकाङ्क्षेत । सवत्सर प्रजाता । तत पतिसोदर्य गच्छेत् । बहुषु प्रत्यासन्न धार्मिक धर्मसमर्थ कनिष्ठमभार्य वा । तदभावेऽप्यसोदर्य सपिण्ड तुल्य वा । आसन्नमेतेषामेव क्रमः ॥

अर्थशास्त्र III. 4

14 cf उच्छिन्नाश्रयकातरेव कुलटा गोत्रान्तर श्रीर्गता । MR VI 5

15 कौटिल्य has given the circumstances under which all prisoners are to be released, at अर्थशास्त्र II 36.

16 Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the नाट्यशास्त्र has quoted from प्रतिज्ञाचाणक्य, a play on the same story apparently as that of the मुद्राराक्षस, composed by महाकवि भीम This play, when it comes to light, might throw good light on some of the problems concerning विशाखदत्त and his मुद्राराक्षस

CHAPTER VI

1 p 84 ff

2 p 20, and p 42f

3 for def see दशरूपक I 67

4 pp. 20, 22 and 24

5 p 100. In fact राक्षस recognizes in as ईश्वरी वाक्.

6 cf एकाहाचरितैकार्थमित्थमासन्ननायकम् ।
पात्रैस्त्रिचतुरैरङ्कस्तेषामन्तेऽस्य निर्गम. ॥ दशरूपक ३.३६.

7 It may be observed that the distance separating Kusumapura from the capital of Malayaketu is over a hundred yojanas according to IV 1 which reads योजनशत समधिक in some editions.

8 pp. 22, 26, 32 (twice), 34 (twice), 84, 136 (twice) and 140.

9 cf I 6

10 The festival is referred to as पार्वण विधि (Full-moon festival at III 10)

11 cf IV. 19

12 cf अद्य दशमो मासस्तातस्योपरतस्य । (p 102).

13 p 66.

14 cf IV 16-17.

15 cf इदानीं प्रत्यासन्ने कुसुमपुरे न कोऽप्यमुद्रालाञ्छितो निर्गन्तु प्रवेष्टु वानुमोद्यते । (p. 124)

16 In fact राक्षस hears the tumultous cries of joy raised by चन्द्रगुप्त's men at मलयकेतु's capture in act VI cf. अये किमिदमस्मिन् काले पटुपटहशङ्खमिश्रो नान्दीनाद. । et seq

17 The time required for going from कुसुमपुर to मलयकेतु's capital can be roughly calculated from the fact that Act I is separated from Act III by at lest one month (i. e. from one पौर्णिमा to another) which, therefore, is approximately the period required for a man to make a return journey from one place to the other.

18 cf आर्य, चिरदर्शनेनार्यस्य वयमुद्विग्नाः । (p 142) The last visit that मलयकेतु paid to राक्षस was in Act IV (p 102),

19 p. 172 Also see p 160

20 cf प्रसीदतु वयस्य । दृष्टमात्र एवार्यचाणक्येनाज्ञप्तोऽस्मि यथा—'सिद्धार्थक गच्छ । इम प्रियोदन्त देवस्य चन्द्रश्रियो निवेदय' इति । तत एतस्य निवेद्यैवमनुभूतपार्थिवप्रसादोऽह प्रियवयस्य प्रेक्षितु तवैव गेह चलितोऽस्मि । (p. 156)

21 cf p. 10

22 cf बीजबिन्दुपताकाख्यप्रकरीकार्यलक्षणा. ।
अर्थप्रकृतय. पञ्च ता एताः परिकीर्तिता. । दशरूपक १-१८

23 cf. अवस्थाः पञ्च कार्यस्य प्रारब्धस्य फलार्थिभि ।
आरम्भयत्नप्राप्त्याशानियताप्तिफलागमा· ॥ दशरूपक १-१९

24 cf. अर्थप्रकृतय पञ्च पञ्चावस्थासमन्विता ।
यथासख्येन जायन्ते मुखाद्या पञ्च सन्धय. ॥
अन्तरैकार्थसम्बन्ध सन्धिरेकान्वये सति ।
मुखप्रतिमुखे गर्भ सावमर्शोपसहृति ॥ दशरूपक १ २२—२४

25 cf. दशरूपक १-२५

26 cf. दशरूपक १-३०

27 cf दशरूपक १-३६

28 cf दशरूपक १-४३ where it is named अवमर्श

29 cf. दशरूपक १-४८

30 This paragraph is based on statements made by ढुण्ढिराज in his commentary on the मुद्राराक्षस.

31 These are defined as follows –

सर्वश्राव्य प्रकाश स्यादश्राव्यं स्वगत मतम् ।
and त्रिपताकाकरेणान्यानपवार्यान्तरा कथाम् ।
अन्योन्यामन्त्रण यत् स्याज्जनान्ते तज्जनान्तिकम् ॥

दशरूपक १ ६४—६५

32 cf The stage-direction प्रविश्य पटाक्षेपेण (p 184)

33 cf The direction तत प्रविशति जवनिकावृतशरीरो मुखमात्रदृश्य· चाणक्य । (p. 186).

34 cf The stage direction जवनिका करेणापनीयोपसृत्य च । (p. 186).

35 The existence of other curtains, which could be dropped or raised when necessary is also proved by stage-directions which make a person enter the stage seated on a seat (प्रविशति आसनस्थ·) [p. 74] together with (सह, pp. 98 and 138), or followed by (अनुगम्यमान , P. 40) another person or persons

CHAPTER VII

1 cf वत्स, श्रोत्रियाक्षराणि प्रयत्नलिखितान्यपि नियतमस्फुटानि भवन्ति (p 22)

2 cf. कायस्थ इति लघ्वी मात्रा । (p 16)

3 cf. विष्णुगुप्त, न मा चाण्डालस्पर्शदूषित स्प्रष्टुमर्हसि । (p 186)

4 cf. The soliloquy of मलयकेतु in Act IV. (p 102).

5 cf स सम्प्रति दत्ताभरणादिविभवो ज्वलन प्रवेष्टुकामो नगरान्निष्कान्त. । (p 168)

6 cf आर्य यद्येव तदिदानीमकाल कुलजनस्य निवर्तितुम् । (p 180)

7 cf. भर्तुश्चरणावनुगच्छन्त्या आत्मानुग्रहो भवतीति (p 182)

8 cf. चन्दनदास·—आर्ये दुर्व्यवसितमिद त्वया । अय पुत्रकोऽश्रुतलोक-सव्यवहारो बालोऽनुग्रहीतव्य. ।

कुटुम्बिनी —अनुगृह्णन्त्वेन प्रसन्ना देवता । (p 182)

9 cf तस्या. कुमारसरोधसम्भ्रमप्रचलिताङ्गुले करात् पुरुषाङ्गुलिपरिणाहप्रमाण-घटिता विगलितेयमङ्गुलिमुद्रिका देहलीबन्धे पतिता उत्थिता तया अनवबुद्धैव मम चरणपार्श्वं समागत्य प्रणामनिभृता कुलवधूरिव निश्चला संवृत्ता । (p 20)

10 cf. उच्छिन्नाश्रयकातरेव कुलटा गोत्रान्तर श्रीर्गता । VI 5

11 cf I 1

12 cf I. 2

13 cf III. 21

14 cf VII 19

15 cf. VI 10

16 cf अये अस्ताभिलाषी भगवान् भास्कर । (p 120)

17 cf I- 17–18.

18 cf. नामान्येषा लिखामि ध्रुवमहमधुना चित्रगुप्त प्रमार्ष्टु । I 20

19 cf. बुद्धानामपि चेष्टित स्वचरितै. क्लिष्ट विशुद्धात्मना । VII. 5

20 cf. कथ क्षपणक आगच्छति । यावदस्याशकुनभूत दर्शन मम समतमेव । तस्मान्न परिहरामि । (p 122)

21 cf राक्षस —[आत्मगतम् । अनिमित्त सूचयित्वा] कथ प्रथममेव क्षपणक' ।

पुरुष — जीवसिद्धि ।

राक्षस —(प्रकाशम्) अबीभत्सदर्शन कृत्वा प्रवेशय । (p 116).

22 cf. I. 6

23 cf (वामाक्षिस्पन्दन सूचयित्वा आत्मगतम्) कथ प्रथममेव सर्पदर्शनम् । (P. 44)

24 See pp. 44 and 100.

25 See pp 20, 22, 24 and 100. It may be noted that राक्षस actually designates this as वागीश्वरी.

26 cf The conversation between चन्दनदास and his wife in Act VII (pp 180 ff)

27 cf दुर्लभास्ते खलु मानुषा य एतस्मिन्काले दृष्टिपथेऽपि तिष्ठन्ति । (p 180)

28 cf एतेऽस्मत्प्रियवस्या अश्रुपातमात्रेण कृतनिवापसलिला इव कथमपि प्रतिनिवर्तमाना बाष्पगुर्व्या दृष्ट्या मामनुगच्छन्ति । (p. 180).

29 cf. p. 32

30 cf कुत सुख येन त्व चिरप्रवासप्रत्यागतोऽप्यद्य न मे गेहमागच्छसि। (p. 154)

31 cf. अहमपि यावत्तस्याश्रोतव्य न श्रृणोमि तावदात्मानमुद्बध्य व्यापादयितुमिद जीर्णोद्यानमागत । (p. 168), किमस्य भवतो यथा सुहृद एव नाशोऽवश । VI. 16, and ततो यावदस्य चन्दनदासस्याश्रोतव्य न श्रृणोमि तावज्ज्वलन प्रविशामीति श्रेष्ठी विष्णुदासो नगरान्निष्क्रान्त । (p 172)

32 Like शकटदास whose innocence was happily conveyed to राक्षस later on in Act VII

33 Like the म्लेच्छ allies of मलयकेतु sentenced to be killed at the end of Act V.

34 As done by राक्षस in the case of मलयकेतु.

35 cf V. 4.

36 See p 160.

37 cf III. 14.

38 cf धिङ्ग मूर्ख, कि भवानस्मदुपाध्यायादपि धर्मवित्तर. । and मूर्ख. सर्वज्ञतामुपाध्यायस्य चोरयितुमिच्छसि । (p 14)

39 cf ये सत्यमेव हि गुरूनतिपातयन्ति III 33

40 cf. स च मया कथमपि पातकमिवाभ्युपगत. (p 70), and III 33.

41 cf वत्स कार्याभिनियोग एवास्मान् व्याकुलयति । न पुनरुपाध्यायसहभू, शिष्यजने दु शीलता । (p 6)

42 cf प्रारब्धा प्रलयाय मासवदहो विक्रेतुमेते वयम् । V. 22.

43 भद्रभट and पुरुषदत्त have been apparently dismissed because they were स्त्रीमद्यमृगयाशील. (p. 86)

44 Such kings are technically known as सचिवायत्तसिद्धि.

45 That is why भागुरायण is afraid that मलयकेतु would order राक्षस to be put to death See p 132

46 cf पृथिव्यामस्खलितपूर्व देवस्य शासन कथ पौरेषु स्खलिष्यति । (p 72). Also read III 22 and 23

47 cf प्रीताभ्य प्रकृतिभ्य. प्रतिप्रियमिच्छन्ति राजान । (p 28), संक्षेपतो राजन्यविरुद्धाभिर्वृत्तिभि । (p 28)

48 cf. VII. 1–2

49 cf राज्य हि नाम राजधर्मानुवृत्तिपरस्य नृपतेर्महदप्रीतिस्थानम् । and the stanza that follows (p 70)

50 cf. स दोष सचिवस्यैव यदसत् कुरुते नृप । III. 32

51 cf प्रज्ञाविक्रमभक्तय समुदिता येषां गुणा भूतये ते भृत्या नृपते I 15.

52 cf III. 32, II 1

53 cf III 14, and VI. 12.

54 cf VII 14.

55 cf. बहुविधदेशवेशभाषासञ्चारवेदिनः नानाव्यञ्जना. प्रणिधय । (p 10)

56 e. g अभयदत्त

57 cf एतेषु त्रय प्रथमे मदीयां भूमि कामयन्ते ते गभीरश्वभ्रमभिनीय पांशुभि पूर्यन्ताम् । (p 152)

58 इतरौ हस्तिबलकामुकौ हस्तिनैव घात्येताम् । (P 152)

59 cf तत प्रविशति द्वितीयचाण्डालानुगतो वध्यवेशधारी शूल स्कन्धेनादाय कुटुम्बिन्या पुत्रेण चानुगम्यमानश्चन्दनदास । (P 178)

60 cf. PP. 172 ff

61 cf वृषल एवास्य प्राणहर दण्डमाज्ञापयिष्यति । (P. 34)

62 cf. विना वाहनहस्तिभ्यो मुच्यता सर्वबन्धनम् । VII 17

63 cf. II 13–14; and IV 16-17, VII 15

64 cf एतेषु प्रथमगृहीतास्त्रयो राजानो मलयकेतोर्विषयमिच्छन्त्यपरौ हस्तिबल कोषं च । (P. 138), also see Nos 57 and 58 above.

65 cf तत प्रभृति सारसाधनसमेतेनेतो निष्क्रम्यार्यचाणक्येन प्रतिपन्न सकलराज-लोकसहितमशेष म्लेच्छबलम् । (p 158)

66 cf अहो विवेकशून्यता म्लेच्छस्य । कुत et seq. (p 162).

67 I 8, VII. 6, III. 22.

68 III 32

69 1-27

70 II 11

71 III 7

72 III. 20

73 III 8 Besides are mentioned भुजगी (I. 8), भुजग (III 11); नाग (III. 21), नक्र and मकर (VII 6)

74 cf I 20, V. 11; and also p 48

75 III. 19, विन्ध्य also is mentioned at IV 17

76 IV. 16.

77 III 9.

78 III 19

79 cf. शकयवनकिरातकाम्बोजपारसीकबाल्हीकप्रभृतिभि (p 48)

80 cf म्लेच्छैरुद्विज्यमाना भुजयुगमधुना सश्रिता राजमूर्ते. । VII. 18.

81 III 15–16

82 P 126

83 P. 160

84 P. 18

85 P. 48

86 II. 19, VII. 7.

87 PP. 190 f.

88 P. 192

INDEX

SANSKRIT CLASSICS

Edited and Annotated

	Rs	as	p.
†Kavyaprakasha of Mammata, Ullas I, II, III* By Prof S S SUKHTANKAR ..	3	8	0
†Kavyaprakasha of Mammata, Ullas X* By Prof. S. S SUKHTANKAR .	5	0	0
†Kumar-Sambhavam, Cantos IV & V Edited by V. R NERURKAR .	1	8	0
†Meghadutam* Edited by V. R NERURKAR	1	0	0
†The Kadambari of Banabhatta, Pp 76-124 of Peterson's Edition Edited by V R. NERURKAR and G V DEVASTHALI . . .	2	0	0
†The Kadambari of Bana,* Pages 124-175 (महाश्वेतावृत्तान्त) By H D KARNIK & V D GANGAL ...	2	12	0
†Vikramorvasiyam* Edited by S B ATHALYE & S. S BHAVE .	2	8	0
†Rashuvamsa of Kalidasa, Cantos VI-IX* Edited by Prof C R DEODHAR .	3	0	0
†Abhijnana Sakuntala of Kalidasa* Edited by Prof C R DEODHAR and Prof N. G. SURU	4	8	0
†Mudrarakshasam Edited by Prof C R. DEODHAR and Prof V. M. Bedekar	4	8	0
†Malavikagnimitram*	2	0	0

Books with * are edited with an Introduction and Notes and those with † contain Translation also